

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:


- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



13025 . E. 79 .



13025 e. 79

Digitized by Google

A
COLLECTION
OF
Controversial Discourses,
Wrote by the Learned
Dr. *GEORGE HICKES*
AND A
Popish P R I E S T.

OCCASIONED

Chiefly by a *Young Lady* that was persuaded
to depart from the Church of ENGLAND to
that of ROME.

To which is added the following TRACTS,

- | | |
|--|---|
| I. Bishop <i>Bull's</i> Answer to the
Bishop of <i>Meaux's</i> Queries. | V. Mr. <i>Chillingworth's</i> Letter,
relating to the Infallibility of
the Church of <i>Rome</i> . |
| II. A Reply to the same Queries
by the Learned Mr. <i>Leslie</i> . | VI. The Grounds of Religion
of the Church of <i>England</i> ,
and its Difference from the
<i>Roman</i> . |
| III. A Letter to an <i>English Priest</i>
at <i>Rome</i> by <i>Rob. Nelson Esq;</i> | |
| IV. Mr. <i>Herb. Thorndike's</i> Judgment
of the Church of <i>Rome</i> . | |


With several other Curious PAPERS.

In Two V O L U M E S.

The Third Edition.

L O N D O N:

Printed for STEPHEN AUSTEN at the *Angel* in
St. Paul's Church-Yard. M.DCC.XXVII.





T O

Robert Nelson, Esquire.

HONOUR'D SIR,

THE many Titles you have to this Collection of Papers, have made the Dedication of it a matter of necessity, rather than of choice. It was in a Letter to you, that the Bishop of Meaux chose to send the Congratulations and Thanks of the Clergy of France, assembled at St. Germain, to the most learned Dr. Bull, now Bishop of St. David's, for the Service he had done the Catholick Church in defending the necessity of believing the Divinity of the Son of God; in which Letter he professeth, that it is matter of astonishment to him, that so great a Man should continue a moment without own-

A 2

ing

The Dedication.

ing of her, and therefore desires to know what he means by the Catholick Church.

It was to you, Sir, that his Lordship sent his excellent Answer to that Letter; an imperfect Abstract of which having stollen into Print, gave an occasion to the Reverend Mr. Leslie of writing another Answer to it, which he thought to have sent to Monsieur de Meaux translated into Latin or French, if he had not been prevented by his Death. I thought it might not improperly accompany the Bishop of St. David's his larger Answer into the publick; and therefore with the Author's consent I have made it a part of this Collection, which is happily concluded with an excellent Letter of your own, that you wrote in Italy to an English Priest at Rome with that felicity of temper, whereof you are master in great perfection; and by the benefit of which you can discourse with all sorts of Men, with whom you differ in matters of Religion, in the same easy and obliging manner, as with those with whom you do agree.

You have also many titles to my own part in this Polemical Collection: For you know the Gentleman, who drew me against my inclination into this Controversy: I acquainted you time after time with the steps of my proceeding in it with him and his Sister; and
I de-

The Dedication.

I desir'd, had I come to oral Conferences with their Guide, to have you sole witness on my side to what had passed between us in all our Arguments. And for these Reasons I think my self oblig'd to make you a publick present of these Papers of Controversy, with that deference which is due to so discerning and learned a judge; with all the Respect, that ought to be paid to so great an Ornament of our Church and Religion; and with all the acknowledgments I ought to make for the honour of your Friendship, which I esteem as one of the providential Blessings of my Life, that God has been pleas'd to reserve for me, as a Comfort in the last and most tiresome part thereof.

In all the Conversation I have had with you, I can truly say I have found you fully answer the great and good Character, that my learned and religious Friend of venerable memory, Mr. Kettlewell gave me of you many Tears, before it was my happiness to be acquainted with you. The love and esteem he had for you was to my knowledge exceeding great while he lived, and at his Death he gave you a sure testimony of his Constancy, in the honourable opinion he had of you in committing his wordly Concerns to your Wisdom and Trust. Sir, I cannot pretend to merit your Friendship to such a degree, as that wor-

The Dedication.

thy Person deserv'd it, who was one of the best of Christians and Divines; but I dare pretend to the same degree of affection and respect, which he had for you to his last breath; and in testimony thereof, I humbly offer this Book to your Acceptance, professing my self ambitious of being reckoned and continued in the number of your most faithful Friends and Servants.

George Hickes.

Ormond-street,
May 3. 1705.

THE

THE P R E F A C E.

I Never yet entred into Controversy but against my Inclinations, which have always carried me to cultivate the more quiet and practical part of Divinity; and therefore ever since I received *Holy Orders*, I have always taken care to shun, but never sought occasions of engaging my self in the Disputes of the times, relating either to Church or State. But contrary to my *Genius* I have been sometimes unavoidably constrained, both by single and concurrent accidents, to write *Palamical* Discourses, particularly in the Controversies betwixt the reformed Church of *England* and that unreformed one of *Rome*.

I was the first time forced to write by the insolence of a *Popish* Physician, who had the confidence to tell one of my † Parishioners in company, that whereas I had in a Sermon lately deliver'd some things concerning the *Popish* Worship of Saints, I was a Liar, and could not prove what I asserted, and bid him tell me what he said. This insult making a great noise in my own and the neighbouring Parishes, I was compelled in

† Of *All Saints Berking*, London.

The Preface.

Vindication of my Religion, as well as of my Reputation, to publish a Book in the Year 1686, entituled, *Speculum beatae Virginis, A Discourse of the due Praise and Honour of the Virgin Mary*; in which I think I proved contrary to what that Physician maintain'd, that the *Roman Catholicks* do much more than desire the Saints to pray for them, *as sick Men desire the Prayers of the Congregation*, or that they only pray to the Saints in Heaven, *as they do their Brethren on Earth to pray for them, in the name and mediation of Christ*.

Shortly after this I was forc'd again in * another place to publish a Discourse in the Year 1687, entituled, *An Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England, in answer to those, who reproach her with the English Heresies and Schisms*. I say, I was forced to it by the perpetual din of some more zealous than prudent or modest *Roman Catholick* Gentlemen, whose practice it then was to ask our People in *Coffee-Houses* and other places, *What the Church of England was? Where it was to be found? And if it was the Presbyterians, or Independents, or Anabaptists, or Quakers?* And then after these and such like impertinent and provoking questions, they used to bid them go to their Bishop or their Dean, and pray either of them to let them know in such a number of *Sects, where they might find the Church of England*.

The excellent † Bishop, worthy of everlasting Memory, being by long Sickness then reduced to a very weak condition, the province of vindicating our Church against the open Reproaches of those

* Worcester.

† Dr. William Thomas.

The Preface.

Gentlemen was devolv'd providentially upon me; of which by God's Assistance I acquitted my self in that Discourse with such success, that after the publishing of it those Gentlemen became very quiet; and never after that I could hear of, reproached the Church of *England* with the English Heresies and Schisms.

I am now a third time engaged in Controversy with an unknown Adversary, and by an unforeseen accident, which was not in my Power to prevent. In the *Octaves* of Christmas in the year 1703, as I happened to be alone in my own House, a young Gentleman of good appearance and address came to me; and after making an apology in such manner, as the civility of Strangers obligeth them to do, he told me he came to ask me a question, which I remember was to this effect: *Whether the Fathers were not the best judges between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, in the Controversy concerning the Doctrine of Transubstantiation?* To which I reply'd in these or the like words: *That the consentient Testimony of the Fathers was undoubtedly the best and surest evidence for or against the truth of any Doctrines in dispute between the two Churches; and particularly in the Controversy of Transubstantiation, we of the Church of England were willing to have it try'd by that Testimony, whether that Doctrine were true or false.* Then he asked me, if I had read a Book entituled *Nubes Testium*; I answer'd, that I had read it about nineteen Years ago, when it was first publish'd. Then he ask'd me again, if the Fathers cited in that Book were truly cited; to which I reply'd, that to the best of my remembrance many of them were partially cited, and all falsely, fallaciously, and impertinently apply'd; adding, that a good answer to it had been publish'd many Years

The Preface.

Years since, to which I referr'd him. He told me he had not heard of that answer, and so other Company coming in and interrupting all farther Discourse he took leave; when waiting upon him to the Door without asking his name, I desir'd to know, if he ask'd that question about *Transubstantiation* upon his own Account or of some other Person? *Not upon my own account, Sir,* (said he with an accent of Zeal) *for I thank God I am a Roman Catholick, but for another Person.*

Some time after he came to me again to desire me, as he was pleas'd to speak, to give a charitable visit that Evening to a Gentlewoman at his House. I then began to apprehend what was coming upon me; and having ask'd where his House and who that Gentlewoman was, I told him I would wait upon her that Evening, betwixt five and six a Clock. This Gentlewoman was his Sister, whom he had profelyted to the Church of Rome. At the time appointed I went, as I promised, to his House, where he was pleas'd to conduct me up stairs with great civility to the dining room; where seeing two Gentlewomen, I ask'd him which of them was his Sister; which having told me, we sat down, and then he said, Sir, *the question my Sister would ask of you is this, Whether the Fathers, &c. as in the question he had ask'd me at my House. After he had repeated the question, I spoke to his Sister in these words; Madam, before I answer this, I must beg leave to ask you another question, to which I expect you'll return a plain positive answer: Are you already reconciled to the Church of Rome or not? This question, as I perceived, was not expected from me, because it put the Lady to a stand, who after a longer silence than such an easy question needed, reply'd: Indeed, Sir, I cannot deny, but that I am almost*

The Preface.

almost perfectly satisfied. Then said I, Madam, why was I sent for? I am desired to come to you, as Physicians sometimes are to visit Patients, when there are no hopes of recovery. I said a great deal more upon that occasion, as I thought I had just reason, which I judge needless to repeat, and then proceeded to give the same answer to the question her Brother had put for her, which I had given him before; adding, that if they pleased to put the merit of the Controversy between the two Churches upon the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and try it by the testimony of the Fathers, I would be content to allot one Day in every Week to examine the Fathers of the five first Centuries, with her Guide or any other of their Priests, in order to come to an issue in that point; and when her Brother objected, that would take up too much time, I offer'd to make short work of it by agreeing to stand or fall in that dispute by the sole authority and testimony of St. Augustin, the great Doctor of the Latin Church. But this neither being accepted, I took leave, not expecting to hear any more from them.

Not many days after, the Gentleman came again to me in the Evening, to tell me his Sister desired to give me a visit, which, altho' fasting, and wearied with a long Walk, I consented to receive within an hour. He came along with her; and after common forms upon such occasions, he told me, that what I had said to his Sister of the danger she would be in, if she turned Roman Catholic, had made her desirous once more to speak with me. This gave me a new occasion to set before her the great danger of her Apostacy: I told her again, that the moment she went over to the Church of Rome, she must be responsible to God for all the Errors, Abuses, and Corruptions of it in Doctrine, Worship, and Government, which

The Preface.

which were many and grievous; and I beseeched her by her eternal Salvation to give her self time to compare the Doctrine, Worship, and Government of the two Churches one with the other, in their Creeds, Offices, and Constitutions, telling her, that was the best way to judge which of the two Communions was the most pure and primitive, when they were so set one against the other. I told her common decency and the Duty she ow'd the Church in which she had been bred, required she should do this, and I offer'd to assist and direct her in the work; putting her in mind, how many Months she had conversed with *Romish* Priests, without once communicating her doubts to any Minister of the Church of *England*; and that justice to her self, as well as to the Cause of the Religion she had professed, required she should be impartial, and hear from us at one Ear, as she had a long time hearkened to our Adversaries at the other. At least, I told her, she ought to have a new hearing of the Cause before us and them together; that otherwise her partiality would aggravate the Crime of her revolt, and that her danger would be much greater, than that of those who were bred up in the Church of *Rome*. And because we had discoursed of Transubstantiation, I begg'd leave to set before her the contradictions of that Doctrine, its inconsistencies with the Latin Canon of the Mass, and offer'd to shew her the monstrous and horrible Indignities and Dishonours it reflected upon our Saviour's blessed Body and Blood, supposing such defects should happen in the celebration of the Mass, as the Roman Missal recites. I also offer'd again to try the truth of that Doctrine by the Fathers, particularly by *St. Augustin*, if she would be concluded by his Authority. But she said, she had rather it should be

The Preface.

be try'd by St. Cyril, meaning St. Cyril of *Hierusalem*, to which I consented; telling her, that to determine any Disputes which might arise from St. Cyril's words, it would be convenient at the Conference to have the Fathers by us, who wrote in the Age wherein he lived.

After this I expected when the Conference would be appointed, in which we were to examine the Doctrine of Transubstantiation by the Writings of St. Cyril, or some others of the Fathers; but after some Days her Brother came again to tell me, that the Gentleman (meaning the *Missioner*) I was to meet, desired the Conference might be about *the Infallibility of the Church*. This I also accepted, desiring the Dispute might be in Writing. But, as you will find in my Adversary's Reply to my Answer, the Gentleman mistook the *Infallibility* for the *Indefectibility* of the Church.

In order to this dispute about *Indefectibility*, he sent me a Paper called a *Query* from my unknown Adversary, with which our Controversy began. I was very unwilling at that time to enter into Controversy, being then, as I told him, intent upon a great work of another nature, which was enough for all my time and thoughts. But there was no remedy, for I feared, had I declined the Dispute, that ill use would have been made of it; and perhaps it was not without the special Providence of God, that I was brought under a necessity to leave this testimony behind me against the *Popery* of the *Roman Church*. Concerning which I here declare, that if I were in such streights, that I could not upon Catholic Principles join my self to any other Communion; I must rather chuse to dye, as some good Men have done, in the melancholy state of *Segregation*, than join in Communion with the Church of *Rome*.

How

The Preface.

How two of the other Papers of Controversy in this Collection came to be written, doth appear in p. 227. from the Bishop of Meaux's Letter, which he wrote to that most worthy Gentleman Mr. Nelson. An imperfect Abstract of this, which stole into print, invited the Reverend Mr. Leslie to write an Answer in another Letter to that famous Bishop; which if his Lordship had lived, he designed to send him. Having told me he had writt'n such a Letter, I desir'd him to communicate it to me; which when he had done, I imparted to him what I had written in the Controversy, and propos'd to him to let me publish his Letter to the Bishop with my Papers, to which he consented, if I thought it fit to be made publick. After I had read it, I shew'd it to Mr. Nelson, who told me he daily expected an Answer to Monsieur de Meaux's Letter from the Reverend Dr. Bull, which he shortly after receiv'd from him. When he perus'd the learned Doctor's Answer, he did me the favour to communicate it to me. I read it over with that great delight and satisfaction I expected from so great a Pen, which oblig'd me to desire him to let the Doctor know, what I intended to publish; and to pray him to give leave, that my Papers might have the Honour to appear in publick with his. The Doctor of his great Humility was pleas'd to grant my Request; and I make this grateful mention of his and Mr. Leslie's Condescension, because I esteem it an honour to have the Papers of two such excellent Men seen in one Collection with mine: It would indeed be great Arrogance in me, and a diminution of them, if I should think I could add to either of their Praise by any thing I could say of them; one of them having made his Name immortal by his most learned Works

The Preface.

Works in Latin, in which he defended the *Nice Faith* against *Sardius*; for which he received the thanks of our generous Adversaries, the *General Assembly* of the Gallican Church, by the Pen of Monsieur de *Meaux* in his Letter dated from *St. Germain's*, where the Assembly sat. In which he desired Mr. *Nelson* to acquaint the Doctor with the Congratulations of all the *Clergy of France* there assembled, For the great Service he hath done the *Catholic Church* in so well defending the necessity of believing the Divinity of the Son of God.

The other is well known among us for his excellent Writings in English against *Atheists*, *Deists*, *Socinians*, *Quakers*, *Erastians*, and *Latitudinarians*, for which he will never be forgotten; and one thing is to be added, not for his Praise (for that is due to God) but to set forth his Felicity, that since the time of Archbishop † *Land* and Dr. *Th. Moreton* Bishop of *Durham*, no Man hath had his Labours blessed with such success, or made so many Converts from Error to Truth, and from no Principles to Principles, and so considerable among their several Parties, as he.

The last Paper with which mine have the Honour to appear abroad, is a Letter which Mr. *Nelson* wrote in his foreign Travels to an *English Priest* at *Rome*. After he had obtain'd Dr. *Bull's* consent, that his Papers should be printed with mine, I thought he would not deny me his own, which he had communicated to me, I ask'd it of him, because I had a mind to secure it to the publick;

† To the number of twenty two Protestants from the Chancell of *Rome*, as he pleaded at his Trial in his own defence, where they are all named. One of these was the famous Mr. *Chillingworth*. This his Persecutors could not deny. See *Canterbury's Doom* by *William Fynde*, p. 55.

and

The Preface.

and shew Gentlemen by so good an Example, how they may travel abroad with reputation to their Religion and Country, as well as to themselves. I need say no more of this Gentleman, whose great Worth and Talents are known every where by his most excellent Book of the *Festivals and Fasts of the Church*, which is receiv'd with the highest Commendation in all places. For besides the acceptance it hath in a short time found at home in so many Editions, it is now translating abroad into several foreign Languages, for the benefit of the publick where those Languages are spoken. To this Book I must now add that of the *Great Duty of frequenting the Christian Sacrifice*, to which is prefix'd an *Exercise upon Confirmation*; and the *Life of Dr. George Bull, late Lord Bishop of St. David's*, both which have been publish'd by him since the former Edition of this Book. In his Travels he easily got acquaintance with many great Men, of which the Bishop of *Meaux* was one; and I cannot but think, that by his prudent mediation between the Bishop and his learned Adversaries, the Controversy would have been carried on with great Decency and to very good effect; but it was not God's time, who took the Bishop out of the World, before these Letters were sent to him.

Indeed Controversy, tho' not pleasant in it self, loses much of its unpleasant nature, when one hath to do with such fair and generous Opponents, as that famous Bishop. But it is my misfortune to enter the Lists with an Adversary of another *Genius*, who seeming to want the noble Courage of the Lion, hath used all the Tricks of a Fox, in playing the part of a Sophister in every Line of his *Complicate Query*, and in every Paragraph of his Defence thereof; treating me throughout, as if I had never learned, or had for-
got

The Preface.

got my *Logick* and the Laws of Disputation, or were to be puzzled or baffled with Fallacies, with which I am tempted to believe he hoped to tire me, or, it may be, had so mean an opinion of me, as to think they were above my skill to solve.

I have been forced to follow him in all his windings and turnings, as he led me, which hath caused me to repeat some things twice or thrice over; which the Reader, I hope, will pardon, because my Repetitions were unavoidable, and because I have endeavoured to make them short. I have also been forced to prove the same things in several places; but then I have taken care to prove them by several Authorities, because I thought some Testimonies and Authorities more convenient and proper in some places, than others: And they all concur in illustrating the natural and true Notion of the *Catholick Church*; and to shew that the Church of *Rome*, in ancient times, was never esteemed more than one Part or Member thereof. I have industriously made use of the Authorities and Arguments of the more modern *Greeks* against the *Latins*; because I thought it might probably be as pleasant to others, as it hath been to me, to observe how they and our Writers, without any communication one with another, argue in the same manner against the Papal Usurpations, and the Arrogance and Absurdity of the *Romish* Writers, in appropriating to the Church of *Rome* the stile of the *Catholick Church*. For the same reason I have also cited the Authority and Opinions of the free Writers of the *Gallican Church*, which if Monsieur de *Meaux* ever read, I wonder he should ask Dr. *Bull*, what he meant by the *Catholick Church*? It is written of our blessed Lord, that he marvelled at the unbelief of
b his

The Preface.

his Countrymen; and considering the Learning and Penetration of Monsieur *de Meaux*, one would be astonished that he should put that Question, and not understand and believe the *Catholic Church* to be one Society or Body spiritual, made up of all faithful Churches, of which Christ alone is the Head. But contrary to this true and easy Notion of it, the *Roman* Doctors make the present *Roman* and *Catholic Church* to be Equipollent and Convertible terms; and when ever they speak of *the Church* or *the Catholic Church*, they only understand their own Church by it, which in all Disputes with us they commonly suppose and take for granted to be the whole *Catholic Church*. My Adversary supposeth it to be so in his *Query*, and is much out of humour in his *Reply*, because I took notice of it in my Answer. This obliged me to shew at large the notion the Antients had of the *Catholic Church*, and of the *Roman* as a Part of it, out of the Fathers; and I am glad I did it, Mr. *Leslie* having shew'd it only out of St. *Cyprian* in his Letter, and the most Learned Dr. *Bull* having not insisted on it, as being needless to his Design, which was to shew at large the Corruptions of the *Roman Church*; which I have done only summarily and in short, and Mr. *Leslie* wholly omitted, as thinking himself only obliged to let the Bishop of *Meaux* know, what we mean by the *Catholic Church*.

My Adversary in his Letter of *April* the 10th, p. 207, 208. for Answer to what hath been written against Transubstantiation by *Albertinus*, and the Pope's Supremacy by *Launoy* and Dr. *Barrow*, refers me to *GUALTERUS* and *COCCIO*, two such doughty Champions of their Church, as I am confident that many of their learned Men would now be ashamed to refer their Opponents

to

The Preface.

to in those or any other Points. Of COCCIVS I have given † an account, enough to make a modest Adversary blush. But I could not then give any account of GUALTERRUS, because I could not get his Book, which is very scarce among us. The Title of it is, *Tabula Chronologica status Ecclesie Catholice à Christo nato ad Annum MDCXIV. In qua duodecim Columnis exhibentur summi Pontifices, & Antipapæ, Concilia, & Patriarchæ quatuor veterum Ecclesiarum, &c. Nec non veterum errorum cum recentioribus Calvinianæ Sæcæ hæresibus, at demum duodecim ex istis, quæ vel nunc Calvinismus impugnât, Catholicarum veritatum Confirmatio, &c.* Autore Jacobo Qualtero. Lugduni MDCXVI.

Seven of his twelve Catholick Verities are, *Transubstantiation; Invocation of Saints; The religious Use and Veneration of Relicks and Images, especially of the holy Cross; The Celibacy of Priests; Purgatory, and Prayers for the Dead; The Primacy of St. Peter, and the Roman Church; The Infallibility of the Church in her Decisions, Decrees, and Traditions.* Which he proves by forged and spurious Writings, or by the Words of true Authors egregiously wrested and misapplied. Let us give some account of the noble Atchievements of this Catholick Champion, of which his first Century will afford us a Specimen. There he goes about to prove Transubstantiation out of the *spurious* Martyrdom of St. Andrew, said to be written by Achaias the Presbyter, particularly out of his Confession, which that Forger relates him to have made before Agæas the Tyrant. Another of his Authorities is taken out of the Epistle to the People of Bourdeaux, forged in the name of

The Preface.

St. *Martialis*, to which I may add the Liturgies of St. *Peter*, St. *James* the Elder, and of St. *Matthæw*, and St. *Mark*, as if written by them; and the Works under the name of *Pseudo Dionysius Areopagita*, as if they had been written in that Century by the true *Areopagite*. In this Century he also cites the spurious Acts of the Passion of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, forged in the name of St. *Linus*, the spurious Epistle of St. *Ignatius* to *Iheron*, the Deacon, and what is said in the name of the Apostles in the interpolated Apostolical Constitutions falsely ascrib'd to St. *Clemens Romanus*. In his Collation of the Errors of this Century with those of the *Calvinistical Sett*, by which he understands the Protestants in general, the Title of the first Chapter is, *De Judâ Iscariote Sacramentariorum Principe*; Of *Judas Iscariot* the chief of the *Sacramentarians*; where he also writes thus: "*Judas Iscariot*, the Traytor, who was the first Apostate and first Heretick of Christianity, may of right be esteemed the first Architect of the pretended *Calvinian* Reformation, especially in three things. First, In impugning the holy Mass, and Reality of the Eucharist, &c. This is my Adversary's *Catholick* Champion of the *Catholick* Verities, to whom he sends me for an Answer to *Albertinus*, *Launoy*, and *Barrow*, though the eldest of them wrote nine and thirty Years after him; and if he thinks him such a noble defender of *their Catholick Verities*, let him put the issue of the Controversies about them betwixt their Church and ours upon his authorities and proofs. Let him prove out of him, if he can, that the Doctrines in dispute between us and them were Doctrines of Faith in the five first Centuries. This I have often called upon him to do; and if he can prove That out of *Gualterus's* authorities,

an

The Preface.

an author to whom he hath in a manner appealed, it will be much for his honour to make his proofs good.

In the 70th page I have cited an ancient poetical harmony of the Gospels extant in the *Cottonian* Library, written in the *Francick* or old *German* Tongue. In which I have observed there are no *Titles* or *Appellations* given to the ever-blessed Virgin *Mary*, but such as any Protestant may give her, especially in a Poem, as that History of our Saviour's Life is. The Original Titles I have since met with in my Collections, and judge it not inconvenient to set them down here, hoping they may gratify the curious Reader (as certainly they will, if he be studious of *the old Septentrional Learning*) as well as prove what I affirmed.

Munelica magat. Thia Davides bohtor bi-urlic Wif, Walbenbe Wurchirig. Ibis enshoful. Ures brohtines modor, ibero rconioft, ellero Wuwo whitigost. Theru helagun thior-num Marium thero guobun. Wifo Sconiofta. Fagar helag thiorno, thiu magat. Fagero, frio Sconiofta thiu modor. Mis thero Godes thior-num. Ibis thero Guobun. Giwritun him than te hus thanan fan Hierusalem Ioseph enbi Maria helag hiwyrki; Habbun im hefan Cuning jmla ze gerithe juno brohtines. Enbi ina that Wif behels thiu thiorno Gethiubo. Mis thero guo-dan thiornan. Giwritun im thuo eft an Galileo Land Ioseph enbi helag hiwyrki hefan Cuninges. Gifragh after thiu eft othron sage athal cunnes Wif jalrg thiorna that he under them gerithie ni was. Thru Godes thiorna. Munelia magat thar Maria was mis iro jume jelfo jalrg thiorna Mahtiges sluoder. Than jtuos thar a Maria muoder Cristes blec under them bome. Ibis un-wemma. The Sanctimonial Virgin. The Daugh-

The Preface.

ter of David, dearly beloved Woman worthy of the Lord, Lady full of Grace. Mother of our Lord, fairest of Ladies, most beautiful of all Women. Of the holy Maiden, Mary the pious. Fairest of Women. The fair holy Maiden, the Virgin. The most beautiful Mother of a fair-Offspring. With the Maiden of God. Of the Virtuous Lady. Then Joseph and Mary his holy Wife returned home from Hierusalem, always having the King of Heaven, the Son of God, in their Company. And that Woman the blessed Maiden beheld (it) the Star. With the devout Maiden. Then Joseph and the holy Spouse of the King of Heaven returned into Galilee. After this the Woman of noble Race, the blessed Maiden, understood that he was not in the Company. The Maiden of God. There Mary the sanctimonial Virgin, the blessed Maiden, Mother of the Almighty, was her self with her Son. Then Mary the Mother of Christ stood all the while there astonish'd under the Cross. The unblemish'd Lady.

She is also often plainly without Epithets called *Maria*, *Mary*. Thiu is, the Lady. Thiu thiora, the Maiden. Is muoer, his Mother. That Wis, the Woman. Thiu magat, the Virgin, &c. Here is no *Gloriosa Domina*; no *Regina Caelorum*; no *Domina Angelorum*; no *Regina Mater Misericordia*; no *Spes nostra*; no *Mater Gratia*; no *Mariæ stella*; no *Celi Porta*; no *Gloriosa intercessio*; no *Regis alii janua*; no *Porta lucis*; no *Celi Fenestra*; in short, nothing of her Merits and Intercession, not one Prayer to her for any temporal Mercy or spiritual Blessing, nor any *Apostrophe* like a Prayer. Which with the Poet's plain description of the Institution of the holy Eucharist, which I have printed in p. 192. of my *Saxon Grammar*, as well as the Language in

The Preface.

in which the Book is written, make me believe the Author wrote it about the time of *Charles the Great*, before or not long after the second Council of *Nice*; when the *Northern World* was not yet taught the worshipping of Saints, nor the Doctrine of the corporal presence of Christ in the holy Eucharist; of which, as *Bellarmin* and *Sirmondus* both acknowledge, *Paschasius Radbertus*, Monk of *Corbey*, was the first teacher who flourished some time before the middle of the ninth Century. This Doctrine, after the first broaching of it, was always opposed in the *English-Saxon Church*, as is evident not only from *Ælfric's Paschal Homily*, but many other passages of the *Saxon MSS.*, cited in both the † Volumes of the *Septentrional Literature*, which I publish'd at *Oxford* in 1705. And it never was taught in *England*, till the *Normans* subdu'd it; when *Lanfranc* being made Archbishop of *Canterbury* wrote against *Berengarius*. And about that time, I suppose, it was when that Homily was made for the CORPORAL PRESENCE, of which Mr. *Wanley* hath given the World a Specimen in the 227 page, col. 1. of the second Volume of the *Septentrional Literature*, cited above in the preceding period.

In p. 189. I have cited Sir *Humphrey Lynde* with particular respect; and I cannot but wish for the Honour of our Church and the publick Good, that his excellent Works, *Via tuta* and *Via devia*, were reprinted with Dr. *Faery's* Defence of him against the impudent Jesuit, *J. R.*

I must also inform my Reader, that whatever he shall find inserted within these marks [] in my answer to my Adversary's Reply, was not in the Copy I sent him, but is since added at more

† Vol. I. p. 59, 63. Vol. II. p. 109, 110, 111.

The Preface.

leisure for the farther proof and illustration of what I first wrote. I have also taken the liberty to change some words and expressions in the written Copy, not to alter the sense in any place, but because I thought the words and expressions I have put in the printed Copy, more proper and significant of it, than those in the written Answer were. I wrote down all those alterations with a design to print them in this Preface, and I am sorry that I am disappointed by the loss of them; but if my Adversary thinks I have done him any wrong, or taken any unjust advantage against him by them, he hath free liberty to print them, if he thinks they will expose me and do him any service.

I have also added an APPENDIX of Papers, because I thought them all very useful and serviceable to our Religion, and some of them of such a nature, as ought never to be out of Print. The first is a Paper of Mr. *Herbert Thorndike* to shew that the Church of *Rome* may err in matters of Salvation. They were his last Thoughts of Popery, which he sent to a Lady a little before his death; and I was the more willing to reprint them, because many misapply'd and wrested passages have of late been cited out of his Works in the late *Essay towards a proposal for Catholick Communion*, which with all its Arts, Contrivances, and Fallacies is one of the best Evidences I know, of a necessity of Reformation in the Doctrine, Worship, and Government of the Church of *Rome*. The II Paper is a Letter of Mr. *Chillingworth*, about the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*. I have publish'd it again from a printed Copy, because I think it worthy to be read of all Men, especially by *Protestants*; who when they happen to be assaulted publicly or privately by Popish Priests, may make this use of it, to desire them
to

The Preface.

to answer that Letter, and in the mean time to forbear. The III Paper is the Creed of Pope *Pius IV.* In publishing of which I have follow'd the Example of Sir *Humphrey Lynde*, because I would have all Protestants to know it, and the prodigious Impositions of the Church of Rome in matters of Faith by the knowledge of it. The Missioners conceal it, as much as they can, from the knowledge of those they go about to pervert. I have known some of their Profelytes, who never heard of it; and the Author of the *Essay* above cited, hath no other way of accounting for the additions in it, but by saying that the profession of Faith in the close of it, *This true Catholick Faith, out of which NO MAN CAN BE SAVED, which at this time I profess willingly, and truly hold, I promise, vow, and swear, I will take care, as much as in me lies, that the same shall be most constantly kept and confessed. (with God's help) whole and inviolable to the last gasp, and be holden; taught, and preached by those who are under me, or such as by my Office I am to take care of. I the said N. promise, vow, and swear (this) as God shall help me, and these Gospels of God; I say that* Author had no way to bring off their Church from imposing those additions, but by affirming that the *Nicene Creed* in the beginning of that Creed are the *Contents*; I suppose he would have us understand the *Object* of this profession, and that a Man may make a profession of *that Faith out of which none can be saved, if he consents to the Nicene Creed, tho' he doth not approve of the other Articles that follow.* Dares he teach this at Rome, or in any *Papish* Country? Will he get the Pope to make this declaration *ex Cathedra*? Will the *Apostolical Vicars* among us admit us upon such a declaration, when we are reconciled? When he shall obtain

The Preface.

obtain the Pope's licence to print this at *Rome*, or publish it by his Authority among us, it will then be time enough for us to make Proposals for what he calls Catholick Communion, but before it is too soon. In the mean time I pray this Reconciler to consider, what he would think of a Man, who after he had solemnly before witness signed and sealed a Covenant containing xxiv Articles, and also vowed and sworn faithfully to perform them, should afterwards when he was call'd upon to perform them, pretend that he only obliged himself to the performance of the first twelve.

The IV Paper, concerning the differences in the chief points of Religion between the Church of *Rome* and the Church of *England*, was never before published. I printed it from the very Copy, which Dr. *John Cosins*, afterwards Bishop of *Durham*, gave to the late Countess of *Peterborough*; and from the Popish Creed and this Paper, which is an extract out of the Council of *Trent*, Men may truly and rationally understand what *Popery* is, of which I cannot but wish every Man had a just and right Notion. But the mistakes that Men have made about it, have been of various and ill Consequences. Many who had been taught, that things were *Popery* which are not, finding themselves misled in some matters, have suspected they were deceived in all the rest, and so became more easy Proselytes to the Church of *Rome*. Others, who never found their mistakes, have been carried by them to most unchristian practices, of which Histories give a most tragical Account. And none more tragical and scandalous to the *Protestant Name*, than *Prynne's History of the Charge, Tryal, and Condemnation of Archbishop Laud*, entitled, *Canterbury's Down*; a Book, which alone would convince any serious Man of the necessity

The Preface.

osity and truth of a Judgment to come. There you shall find the daily use of the vii times of Devotion, commonly call'd the vii *Hours*; bowing at the name of Jesus; the wearing of Copes at divine Service; setting of the holy Table Altar-wise with steps to it, and rails about it, and a covering upon it; the purely ornamental and historical use of the Pictures of Christ upon the Cross and the Resurrection; the *Arminian* Doctrines about Free Will, Justification, the Decrees of God, &c. in which the Divines of the Church of *Rome* differ among themselves; and lastly, the ancient Prayer of *Oblation* and *Consecration* of the holy Eucharist, by invocation of the holy Spirit, all arraigned for Popish Errors and Innovations; and many Bishops and Divines, of whom the World was not worthy, particularly Dr. *Cosins*, Author of this Paper, branded for Papists; some of which lived to be great Ornaments of our Church after the happy Restauration, as they had been Champions and Confessors for it before. Other Books will shew you how the Surplice, the Sign of the Cross, the Ring in Marriage have been treated, as Popish Ceremonies; nay, that the Liturgy, as such, hath been represented as Popish, and Episcopacy it self branded as a Popish Usurpation. All which is owing to Mens ignorance of Popery, and the mistaken notions they have of it. And I cannot but wish, that some learned Man, after Dr. *Cosin's* Example, would more largely shew the difference in Doctrine, Worship, and Government between the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome*, not only out of the Council of *Trent*, but out of their Missal, Ritual, Breviary, Pontifical, and other Offices. Such a Book would be a rewardable Work of great Charity to the Souls of the People, of great Service to the Church of *England*, and also tend very much to

The Preface.

to the Honour and Benefit of the Clergy; the best part of which, who are more conscientious than to humour the People in their mistakes, have been, and still will be suspected, if not slander'd for Papists or popishly affected, by those who do not truly know what *Popery* is. It would also contribute much to the publick Peace of Church and State; by obviating the Designs of crafty and cruel *Demagogues*, who abuse the ignorance and credulity of the vulgar, by calling what things they please *Popish*, and making Papists of whomsoever they have a mind to destroy. Thus they wrought the destruction of the great and learned Prelate above-mentioned, and still in vain endeavour to murder him over again in his honour; and thus they have done, and thus they will do, as opportunity serves, unto the end of the World.

The V Paper is a Form or prescribed Office of Worship for the daily Devotion of the vii *Hours of Prayer*, made in all appearance for the use of the Clergy, and more particularly for the use of Religious Houses, in which, I believe, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Psalms, and the Hymns were *alternately* chanted or sung, according to the *Psalmody* or plain sort of *Church-Musick* in those times. Such Offices were anciently instituted in the Church; for we read of vi set Hours of daily Prayer in the *Constitutions attributed to the Apostles*, lib. viii. cap. xxxiv. which begins thus: *Make Prayers at the dawning of the day, at the third hour, the sixth, and the ninth, and at Evening, and at Cock-crowding, &c.* So St. † *Hierom* speaking of the Monastick Virgins in his Epistle *ad Eustochium*, saith he, they sung the Psalms at

† See also his 7th and 8th Epist. and *Cassian de Cenob.* In-
sit. lib. 3. cap. 4.

break

The Preface.

break of day, at the third hour, the sixth and the ninth, at Evening, at Midnight. Mr. John Spelman, Son of Sir Henry, thought himself obliged to print the Latin Prayers at the end of the *Latino-Saxonic* Psalter for *their* || Purity. For the same Reason Mr. Wheloc printed some Saxon Prayers in his Edition of *Bede*, with the Saxon Version; and Mr. Junius others at the end of his *Cædmon*. In like manner the Purity and Chastness of this daily Office invited me to publish it, as a Specimen among the Saxons, in which there is not one direct Address or Prayer to any Saint, but only a devout wish or desire grounded on the belief of the general Intercession of Saints, *that the Virgin Mary, the holy Mother of God, and all the Saints may interceed unto the Lord for us Sinners, that we may be accounted worthy to be assisted and saved by him*: The words after the Collect for the Day are, *Sancta Dei Genetrix Virgo Maria, & omnes Sancti intercedant pro nobis peccatoribus ad Dominum Dominorum, ut mereamur ab eo adjuvari, & salvari, qui † vivis & regnas, &c.*

Not knowing the time when this Office was composed, I will not guess at it. But this I dare say, that when it was made, the worshipping or invocation of Saints had not yet taken place among our Saxon Ancestors; nor was yet intro-

|| *Ad finem Psalmi uniuscujusque optima reperiantur preces in animum Psalmi cujusve composita. Nos quavis ad Linguae Saxonice notitiam nihil prorsus conducant, eas tamen una publicandas æquum duximus. Tum ut librum ipsum fideliter recitemus, tum ut antiquioris Ecclesie Anglicane praxim Synceram ob oculos ponamus, quæ sub illo tempore, ut videtur, nec Beatorum animas, nec beatissimam Virginem Mariam, nec crucem Domini adorandas docuit.*

† *L. Vivit, Regnat.*

duced

The Preface.

duced into any Offices of the English-Saxon Church. It is not till the Xth Century, that we find any Footsteps of it, when in the Homilies on the fictitious Assumption of the blessed Virgin, we find them conclude in these, or such like words ;
 Uton nu geornlice biððan þa eanigan Wifman þe
 nu to * ðæi pæt ahaþen 7 georneoð bucan engle
 þymme. 7 heo ur þingio to þam ælmihtigan
 Gode. Se þe leofaþ 7 rihtað on ealra ƿopulsa ƿo-
 pulo. AMEN : *Come then, let us now earnestly*
pray the blessed Mary, who was this day taken up
and exalted above the dignity of Angels, that she
would interceed for us to Almighty God, who loveth
and reigneth World without end. Amen.

The curious, who delight in such ancient Mo-
 numents, are beholden to the Reverend and Learn-
 ed Mr. *William Elstob*, formerly Fellow of Uni-
 versity-College, *Oxen*, and now Rector of *St. Swi-*
thuns, London, for the translation of it; and I
 think my self obliged to give him publick thanks
 for his assistance in this and * another greater
 Work.

From what I have written in answer to my
 anonymous Adversary, p. 188. I think my self un-
 der some obligation to speak my thoughts more
 freely of the most *Christian* (I am sure) and (I
 think) most effectual way of discouraging and
 disappointing the diligence of the *Missioners*, and
 stopping the growth of Popery among us, which
 is still greater than formerly, notwithstanding the
 increase of Penal Laws. This I take to be a full

* The spelling of this word with (i) shews that this Ho-
 mily was written towards the latter end of the 10th Century.
 So byrri is several times written for byrig.

† See p. 98. *Dissertationis Epist. ad Barthol. Shower, in An-*
tiqua Literatura Septentrionalis, lib. 1.

Supply

The Preface.

supply of the want of Churches and Parish Priests among us, with an honourable provision for the Clergy, whereof so many Thousands of the too small number live meanly or miserably, to the great dishonour of God, whose *Ministers* they are, and the sin and reproach of the Nation, which ought to provide better for the Servants of their Lord and Saviour, who redeemed them with his Blood. For want of a sufficient number of Churches and Parish-Priests, and a sufficient Maintenance of them, the People of *England* in many places are *as Sheep without Shepherds*, wholly obnoxious to the Wolves, which haunt the *places of prey*. I mean the Parishes, that are either exorbitant for the number of Souls, or for their compass and extent, or destitute of able Ministers to defend them, who being very poor, want not only Books and other helps to the knowledge that is necessary for a Divine, but authority to defend their Flocks. In some places there is a deplorable concurrence of all or more of these causes, and from one or more of them it is, that Popery and all other Sects have increased so much in this deplorable state of the Church. The first cause, which is the too great number of People in a Parish, is most observable in our great trading Cities, and most especially in this of *London*, under which I comprehend all the Parishes within the *Bills of Mortality*, where the Labourers are indeed too few, though the Harvest is very great. I live in a Parish where they reckon about Thirty Thousand People; according to which computation, if it be true, there must be about Five Thousand Families in it, which are more by Four Thousand Seven Hundred, than can be well known by one Man, or ought to be committed to the care of one Priest. In this Parish, to my certain knowledge, there are
great

The Preface.

great numbers of Families, who neither know the Minister's Name, nor Person, nor where he dwells; and were it not for the parochial Officers that go about, would not know in what Parish they live. It was in this Parish the young Gentlewoman lived, of whom I have given an account in this Preface. Her Father died in it not many Years since, firm in the Communion of the Church of *England*. Her Brother was travelling abroad at the time of his death, and was perverted in *France* to the Church of *Rome*; and being returned home perverted his Sister, which might have been prevented by the Minister, if in such a multitude it had been possible for him to know this *Lamb* of his Flock, and what danger she was in of the Wolf. I speak this with submission to our Superiours to move their Compassion to the Souls of the People; and I hope the Clergy in Convocation will speedily represent the Miseries of the Church, which proceed from this Cause, and supplicate for timely and effectual redress. For in these over-grown Parishes there are (I fear) ten, or (it may be) twenty *Popish* for one Priest of the Church of *England*; and therefore no remedy can be found so honourable and proper against Popery, and so effectual against the encrease of it, as to multiply the number of Shepherds in proportion to the Flock. I think three hundred Families are a charge fully great enough for any Parish-Priest; according to which proportion there ought to be in the Parish, of which I have spoken, fifteen or sixteen; and within the Bills of Mortality, I cannot guess how many above an hundred new Churches, and as many Parish-Priests.

The *Coal-Act* for rebuilding the Churches in *London*, as I am informed, is now expiring or expired. If that were continued for building of Churches in the vast *Out-Parishes* about the City, the Revenue

The Preface.

venue of it would in the same number of Years build the same number of Churches; and in expectation of them, the People of the new parochial Divisions would undoubtedly be willing to erect Tabernacles; as those of *the City* did.

I say nothing here of the ways of raising maintenance for such a new number of *parochial Priests*, though I think there are more than one, of making it easy to the People; who after they found the comfort and benefit of living in *much less*, but *much more regular* Parishes, where the Pastors and their Flocks might be known to each other, they would cheerfully submit to such an Establishment for their maintenance, as publick Wisdom should enact. Nor will I say how much such a division of the great Parishes into many less would contribute to the publick *civil* Order and Peace. For I need but suggest it to those, who have observed what great numbers of disorderly Houses there are in the over-grown Parishes, and what unknown harbours and lurking places the *Rogues and sturdy Beggars*, who infest all the quarters of the Town, find in them, as in so many great Woods. Which inconveniences and mischiefs would be remedied in a great measure, by a partition or reduction of these greater and ungovernable, into less and more governable Parishes; where not only the Manners of single Persons, but of Families would more easily be observed and known.

The second Cause of the great growth of Popery and other Sects, which is the exorbitant extent and compass of Parishes, is most visible in the Country; and those who know the *Northern Countries and Wales*, must needs be very sensible of the Mischiefs and Misfortunes of the Church, that proceed from this Cause. In such Parishes, though the number of Houses be not too great, yet
c the

The Preface.

the huge distance most of them often are at from the Parish-Church and Minister, and he from them, makes it impossible for such remote Parishioners to receive the Benefit, they otherwise would, from his Ministry, or for him to have the knowledge of what passes among them, or of the dangers their Families are in. In these vast Parishes the Sheep are always obnoxious to the Wolves, and apt to wander from the fold; and to cure this evil, every such Parish is to be divided into two or more, according to its bigness, or if it continue as one Parish, it ought to have more Churches and Priests in proportion to its compass and extent.

The third manifest Cause of the growth of Popery, which proceeds from the *Poverty of the Clergy*, is most commonly found in conjunction with the second; they, generally speaking, in the Country being the Parishes of great extent and compass, where the Tythes are alienated from the Church. I shall not therefore particularly insist upon this Cause of the Churches great Misfortunes, but propose the best and most blessed Remedy I know for the removal of it, wheresoever it is found in greater or lesser Parishes, and that is: restoring the Tythes to the parochial Priests. The purchase of them by the Nation would be easy in times of Peace and Plenty; but by the purchase of them, I mean the purchase of † *appropriated*, as well as *impropriated* Tythes, and also the purchase of them where Lands by *Papal Exemptions*, *Modus's*, or other Causes are now *Tythe-free*. The benefit our Country would receive by this purchase, would be an ample recompence for the cost. For first it would make an atonement for the Sacrilege

† With the purchase-Money of which, *Colleges, Ho's &c.*, and *Collegiate Churches* should be obliged to buy Lands.

of

The Preface.

of the Nation, which for many Years hath been the *judicial*, as well as *natural* Cause of many and great Evils to it; and by consequence the happy effects of such a restitution would be returned in numerous blessings to the State, as well as to the Church. Secondly, the Tythes so purchased and restored would be a worthy Fund of Maintenance for the Children of the People, who contribute to the purchase of them; for the Clergy are the Sons of the *Laity*, their own Flesh and Blood, and therefore in purchasing the Tythes they purchase for their own Families, and make good provision thereby for their Sons, and Sons and Daughters Sons for ever. And whereas now there are but about ten thousand Parish-Priests, whereof at least two thirds live meanly or miserably; there will then, in all appearance, be a competent maintenance for double the number, which God and the Necessities of the Church seem to require. Thirdly, The Church being thus furnished with a sufficient number of parochial Priests and Cures, the People will not so easily be led astray; nor Wolves of any Sect, especially of the *Papish*, have such convenient opportunities of devouring the Flock. On the contrary, when the Church is so well provided in all places with parochial Priests, she will soon be in a condition to reduce the stray Sheep to her fold, and to *reprise* upon the Emissaries of all sorts, particularly those of the *Romish* Church, by converting Papists in all places, where they most abound. Fourthly, Out of the first Fruits of the Tythes so established and restored, and the tenths of them, a competent maintenance may be found for more *Diocesan* Bishops, as well as more Parish Priests: I mean more *Diocesan Bishops without Baronies*, of which there is as great need, as of more Parish Priests.

The Preface.

Could I see these things done, Patronage of Ecclesiastical Livings reformed, and regulated as a *pure trust*, and secured from Simoniackal Contracts (which is easy to be done) penitential Canons with an Office for reconciling *Penitents* made in Convocation, and the Reverend Dr. *Prideaux* the Dean of *Norwich*'s Proposal enacted for incorporating the Bishop and Clergy of every Diocese to provide for their own Poor, I should then say with joy, *Lord, now lettest thou thy Servant depart in peace, for mine Eyes have seen thy Salvation.* But since I am too far advanced in Years to hope to see such an happy change, I will pray for it, as long as I live; trusting that God in Mercy to his Church will in his good time pour out a Spirit of Reformation upon the Priests, and Princes, and People of this Land, that they may all agree to perfect and amend whatsoever is wanting or amiss in the Church.

This is the Scheme, which I humbly offer to them, as the best I know, and most becoming a Christian State, for the suppression of Popery, and with it all other Sects among us. There is nothing in it, that I know can justly offend any sort of Men, but *Atheists*, or *Deists*, or some other sort of Enemies to Christ (if there be any) who hate a *Priest* as such, and dare blasphemously call the *divine Institution* of Priesthood, by the spiteful name of *Priestcraft*. It is a Scheme of *Edification* and not of *Destruction* to Men or Families. It is consistent with entire liberty of Conscience, it hurts no Man's Person or Estate; it fills no Jails with Prisoners, nor Courts of Judicature with bloody Criminal Trials, and needs no other assistance from the Secular Powers, but only not to encourage those who are Enemies to the Church. The blessing of God, I am persuaded, would go along with it;
and

The Preface.

and in this Confidence of his Blessing I have proposed it, as it were on a *Table* exposed to publick view. I hope all Men will accept my good intentions, however they may dislike what I have proposed; and if our Superiours think I have taken too much liberty, as a private Person, I hope in a time of so much Freedom used by all sorts of Men and abused by too many, they will the more easily pardon their humble Servant and most hearty well-wisher to his Country,

GEORGE HICKES.

The following Extract of the Opinion of the Greeks about the Pope's Supremacy, and the Notion they have of the Catholick Church, was sent to me by the Reverend and Learned Mr. Edm. Chishull, Fellow of C. C. C. Oxford, too late to be inserted in its proper place. But rather than the Curious and Learned Readers should want the benefit of it, I thought it would be acceptable to them to print it here: And I think fit to acquaint them for the Honour of that worthy Gentleman, that he had communicated these and other authorities sooner to me, had I had the happiness to be sooner acquainted with him.

For the Reverend Dr. Hickes, at his House in Ormond-street.

Reverend Sir,

“ **S**ince I had the honour of waiting on you, I
 “ have been obliged to be out of Town; but
 “ being now return'd, I remember my promise of
 “ transmitting to you the Opinion of the Greeks
 “ concerning the Primacy of the Pope and the U-
 “ niversality of the Church.

“ Those which I have transcribed into the en-
 “ closed Paper, are very express and very authen-
 “ tick; and will therefore, I hope, come up to
 “ your expectations. But if you desire farther to
 “ consult their particular enlargements upon these
 “ Subjects, be pleas'd in this or in any other mat-
 “ to lay your Commands upon

Your obliged humble Servant,

Edm. Chishull.

THE

THE INCLOSED PAPER.

IN the Confession of the Faith of the Greek Church, compil'd by a Synod at *Jassy* in *Moldavia*, and confirm'd by another at *Constantinople* in the presence of all the four Patriarchs, we have these words, in answer to this Question, "What is secondly implied by our professing to believe in the Holy Catholick Church?"

Ὅτι παρ' ἑαυτὸν τόπος ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία εἴληφε τὸνομα. Ἀι γὰρ τοπικαὶ μερικαὶ εἰσιν, οἷς ἡ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, ἡ ἐν Ἀντιωχείᾳ, ἡ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, ἡ ἐν Ρώμῃ, ἡ ἐν Ἀλιξανδρείᾳ, καὶ αἱ λοιπαί, &c.

• Vide θεολόγον ὁμολογίαν, printed in *Valachia*, Anno 1699. p. 109.

Against the Primacy and Supremacy of the Pope, there are various Tracts in my Collection of this Sort. But for a Specimen of their Opinions in this matter, take the following words of the present Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, in his Preface to his Edition of the Τόμος ἀγάπης.

Μήτε ὁ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, μήτε οἱ λοιποὶ πατριάρχαι, μήτε ἄλλοις τις θεολόγος ἐφρήνησε ποτὲ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐν τῇ καθόλου ἐκκλησίᾳ μοναρχικόν, ἢ αὐτοκρατορικόν, ἢ γενικόν ἀξίωμα, ἀλλ' ἐστὶ κεφαλὴ πρῶτης καὶ μόνῃ τῇ τάξιν, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸ μέγα τι ὄν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Ἔβλεπα φερόμενους οἱ παπισταί, ὅτι οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸν ἡ ἀνατολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν λέγει τὴν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως πρῶτον καὶ κεφαλὴν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ τὸν τῶν ὄντων, ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἐπισκοπὸς Ρώμης πρῶτος καὶ κεφαλὴ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ διὰ τὴν Ρώμης πρῶτος καὶ κεφαλὴ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

The Preface.

κλησίᾳ. Ἄλλ' ἐπεὶ ἔχοντες τὸτο : ἄρα καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐπεὶ
ἀποστολικά τ' Ῥώμης ἔτε προφύτον, ἔτε κεφαλὴν,
ἔτε μὲν διόλου ἐπίσκοπον ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

In another Tome published by the same Patriarch, under the Title of Τομὸς καθολικῆς these are the Summaries of particular Chapters.

Ὅτι ἐμόνον ὁ τ' πρεσβυτέρως Ῥώμης θρόνος ἀποστολικὸς καλεῖται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕκαστος τ' ἄλλων Πατριαρχικῶν θρόνων.

Ὅτι μία καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία, ἐχ' ἡ τ' πρεσβυτέρως Ῥώμης λείπει, ἀλλ' ἡ τ' οἰκουμενικῆς πάσης τ' ὀρθοδόξων.

The

THE CONTENTS.

THE *Query sent to Dr. Hickes by a Popish Missioner,* Page 1.

Dr. Hickes's Answer to the Query, p. 2.
The Missioner's Reply to the Doctor's Answer, p. 14.

Dr. Hickes's Answer to the Missioner's Reply in X Chapters.

CHAP. I.

The Doctor's Reason given for transcribing the Query, p. 25.

The alledg'd mistake of the word HOLY for ROMAN justified, p. 26.

The other pretended mistake, of INFALLIBILITY for INDEFECTIBILITY, clear'd, p. 27.

A Church may be a True Catholick Apostolick Church, tho' it had not its being from the first Foundation of Christianity, p. 32.

CHAP. II.

The Missioner's trifling defence, for disingenuously sending a manifold Query under the name of one in Terms of uncertain Signification consider'd,

p. 34.
The

The Contents.

<i>The Antiquated Question, Where was the Protestant Church before Luther? answered,</i>	p. 43.
<i>The Missioner's undecent Reflections upon A. B. Cranmer retorted upon one of the Popes,</i>	p. 44.
<i>Returning Queries to Queries no new way of answering,</i>	p. 46
<i>Divine Worship paid to a material Cross by the Papists,</i>	p. 47
<i>The Missioner's fallacious Challenge.</i>	p. 53
<i>The Challenge rightly stated,</i>	p. 55
<i>Preliminaries propos'd in order to the Controversy,</i>	p. 55.

CHAP. III.

<i>That the Reformed Church of England professeth the same Faith or Religion, which the whole Catholick Church (that of Rome not excepted) professed a thousand Years ago, prov'd from Councils, ancient Writers, &c.</i>	p. 58
<i>The Lord's Prayer a Rule for Prayer, and the Apostles Creed a Rule of Faith to be learned by Catechumens in the vulgar Tongue,</i>	p. 63
<i>The same Faith or Religion pure and entire without fereign mixtures or additions to the end of the viii Century, which the Church of England now professeth,</i>	p. 64
<i>The first Confession of Faith with new additions in the second Council of Nice, Anno Dom. 787</i>	ibid.
<i>The Decrees of that Council condemned, Anno 794,</i>	p. 66
<i>By another Council held at Constantino-ple, Anno 814,</i>	ibid.

... And :

The Contents:

- *And by a Synod at Paris, Anno 825,* p. 67
How the Church of England agreed then with the
German and Gallican Churches, ibid.
The Church of England the same now as then,
p. 68
The distinction of Veneratio, from Cultus and In-
vocatio, p. 69
The Faith or Religion which the Church of England
now professeth, agrees with Pope Gregory the
Great's Confessions, both before and after his Con-
secration. p. 70, 71, 72, &c.

C H A P. IV.

- What is there meant by the word PERISH,* p. 75, 76
The distinction between a True or Real, and a Sound
Church, p. 79
In what sense a Church may properly be said to
PERISH, p. 83

C H A P. V.

- The word CHURCH used in Scripture in a larger*
and a narrower sense, it sometimes signifies the
whole, sometimes part of the Catholick Church,
p. 85
Used in the same sense by Old Ecclesiastical Wri-
ters, p. 86
The Roman Church but a part of the Catholick
Church, p. 98
The acceptation of the word CHURCH in the larger
general sense for the Church of Rome only, ab-
surd and contrary to that Article, I believe the
Holy Catholick Church, p. 99
The Church of Rome taken only for a particular
Church both by the Ancient Greek and Latin
Writers, p. 102

C H A P.

The Contents.

C H A P. VI.

- The words Church, Church of Christ, Catholick Church, often used to signify a part of the Universal Church,* p. 113
The Church of Rome may perish, and yet the Catholick Church be preserved, p. 120
By the word CHURCH to be understood the Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Church, p. 130

C H A P. VII.

- Dr. Hickee's farther Vindication of his Answer to the Missioner's Challenge, Name your Bishops, Writers, &c. 900 or 1000 Years before the Separation,* p. 135
The difference shewn between a Church morally and metaphysically True, p. 139
Idolatrous Worship proved upon the Roman Church, p. 145
The Sin of Idolatry does not destroy the Being of a Christian, p. 147
An Idolatrous Church may become a pure and morally Holy Church upon Repentance and Reformation, p. 150
The Doctor's Charity for the Church of Rome, p. 152

C H A P. VIII.

- The Church of Rome no Visible Church of Christ, i. e. of faithful Men, where the Sacraments are duly administered.* p. 152
Allow'd to be a Real (though an Impure) Church, p. 160

The

The Contents.

The Church of England no new (but a renew'd and reform'd) Religion, p. 161

C H A P. IX.

The promise of Indefectibility falsely arrogated to the Roman Church, p. 163

Several other Churches have visibly continu'd (tho' not always flourish'd) from their Foundation to this present day, p. 170

Our Ancestors 900 Years ago had no such occasion as we, to protest against Popish Innovations, p. 171

Our Faith the same it was 900 or 1000 Years before Luther, *ibid.*

The Council of Trent a pack'd Council, neither Free nor General, p. 172

The Church of England defended from the Charge of Heresy, p. 174, 175

Multitude no Argument for Universality in the Roman Church, p. 180

Christ the only Head, under which the whole Body of the Catholick Church is united, p. 182

C H A P. X.

The Doctor's repeated Challenge to the Missioner's to shew the Antiquity, Universality, and Succession for the Trent Doctrines during the first five or six Centuries. p. 188, 189

Some Letters which passed between the Missioner and Dr. Hickes, before the Doctor sent him an Answer to his Reply, p. 197

The Missioner's Letter with this Query, By what Linage do you make your Descent good from the

The Contents.

the 4th Century to the pretended Reformation.	ibid.
<i>The Doctor's Answer,</i>	p. 198
<i>The Query turn'd upon the Missioner,</i>	p. 200
<i>The Missioner's Reply to the Doctor's Answer,</i>	p. 204
<i>The Character of COCCIUS, to whom he refers the Doctor, in the Margin,</i>	p. 208
<i>The Answer written to the Missioner's Reply by one of the Doctor's Friends,</i>	p. 211
<i>A Letter of Monsieur de Meaux to Robert Nelson, Esq; in French,</i>	p. 227
<i>-----Translated into English,</i>	p. 229
<i>Dr. Bull's Answer to that Letter,</i>	SECT. I. p. 232
<i>The Roman Church and the Catholick Church not convertible Terms,</i>	p. 233
<i>The great danger of their Salvation, who live in Communion with the Church of Rome,</i>	p. 234
<i>The infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost in the Council of Nice, or any other truly General Council, no Argument for Communion with the Church of Rome,</i>	p. 235
<i>The Doctor's Answer to the Bishop's Question, What is meant by the Catholick Church?</i>	p. 237
<i>The Corruptions of the Church of Rome detested,</i>	SECT. II.
<i>-----In Government,</i>	p. 239
<i>-----In the Rule of Faith,</i>	SECT. III. p. 243
<i>The Reverend Mr. Leslie's Answer to the aforesaid Bishop's Letter.</i>	
<i>What is to be meant by the Catholick Church,</i>	p. 303
<i>The Government of the Church committed to Bishops, who were distinguished by the Titles of Diocesan</i>	

The Contents.

<i>Diocesan Bishops, Metropolitans, Primates, and Patriarchs,</i>	p. 304
<i>From whence the Council of Bishops in the Empire were stiled Oecumenical,</i>	p. 305
<i>The Patriarch of Constantinople claimed the Primacy upon the Seat of the Empire's being translated thither from Rome,</i>	ibid.
<i>An Universal Primacy disclaimed and protested against by Pope Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome,</i>	p. 306
<i>The Pope's Supremacy limited by the Gallican Church,</i>	p. 306, 307
<i>That limitation disputed,</i>	p. 307
<i>Reason for disowning the Pope's Supremacy,</i>	ibid.
<i>The same Reasons might be urged for an Universal Monarch, as for an Universal Bishop,</i>	p. 312
<i>His Answer to the Bishop's Question, How several Churches can be that Kingdom of Christ not divided in it self, and which can never fail?</i>	p. 313, 314
<i>The Schism of such as have broke off from subjection to their lawful Bishops, justly charged upon the Pope's pretended Sovereignty,</i>	p. 318
<i>Every Bishop in his own Diocese may condemn an Heresy, but no Council of Bishops can alter any Fundamental Article of Faith,</i>	p. 321
<i>The Dispute not yet determined where the Infallibility is placed,</i>	p. 322
<i>A Letter to an English Priest of the Roman Communion at Rome, from Robert Nelson, Esq;</i>	
<i>His Opinion of a pretended Miracle,</i>	p. 325
<i>Infallibility has no foundation either in Holy Scripture or primitive Antiquity,</i>	p. 327, 328

The

The Contents.

*The Holy Scriptures and Fathers aspersed by some
of the Romish Writers,* p. 330

APPENDIX.

*Mr. Herbert Thorndike's Judgment of the Church
of Rome,* Paper I.

*Mr. Chillingworth's Letter of the Infallibility of
the Church of Rome,* Paper II.

The Creed of Pope Pius IV. Paper III.

*Bp. Cofin's Letter to the late Countess of Peter-
borough, concerning the difference in the chief
points of Religion between the Church of Rome
and the Church of England,* Pap. IV.

*A publick Office of daily Devotion for the seven
canonical Hours used in the time of the Saxons,
with a Translation and Notes of the Reverend
Mr. Elstob.*

ERRATA.

Page 67. Line 26. read *in quo libro* (*prob dolor !*) p. *ibid.*
l. 28. r. *Maximè* p. 81. l. 1. dele *in.* p. 140. l. 6. dele
be. p. 182. l. 15. r. *those.* p. 253. l. 2. r. *brief.* p. 256.
l. 28. r. *to.* p. 270. Marg. l. penult. r. *ab eodem imperatore. Ro-*
man est. p. 274. Marg. l. 9. r. *cultusque* p. 318. l. 25. r. *Dei.*

Part of Mr. G-----n's LETTER,
beginning with the following
Query sent to Dr. George
Hickes, by a Gentleman late-
ly perverted from the Church
of *England* to the Church
of *Rome*.

SUPPOSING *this for true, That the Church
of Christ can never perish, I desire to know
(if the Protestant Church be the true
One) where it was for many hundreds of Years
before Luther? Name your Bishops, Writers,
Churches, nay one single Congregation, or Vil-
lage of Protestants, for 900 or 1000 Years,
before your Separation from the holy Catholick
Church.*

THE Gentleman, Sir, I spoke to you of the last
time I had the honour of waiting on you, being
to quit the Town in a very short time, is willing
to delay no longer our Business in hand; in order
to which proceeding, I here send you, as from
him, the above-written Query, &c.

February 28. 1704.

B

Dr.

Dr. Hickes's ANSWER to the foregoing Query. In a Letter to Mr. G--n.

S I R,

March 4. 170 $\frac{3}{4}$.

LAST Wednesday, being *Ash-Wednesday*, in the Afternoon, I receiv'd a few Lines from you under the name of a *Query*, containing a *Supposition*, a *Question*, and a *Challenge*; which, you say, you sent me from the Gentleman you lately spoke of to me, and who you then told me was a Priest, and by consequence, one of your Guides. Had you not told me you sent them from a Man of his Character, who was appointed by his Superior to manage the Controversy that is between your Church and Ours, I should rather have thought they had been penn'd by some *Novitiate*, or late Convert, who was not skill'd in Controversy; First, Because they are, as I conceive, nothing to the purpose of *the Infallibility of the Church*, the Subject in which, at your desire, we are to be engag'd. And, Secondly, Because they are unaccurately penn'd in terms of uncertain Signification; and take the main thing for granted, which is in dispute between our Church and yours. The Supposition is penn'd in these Words; *Supposing this for true, that the Church of Christ can never perish*. Where I desire to know, What the Gentleman means by *perish*? And, Secondly, What he means by *the Church of Christ*? For *perish* may signify, that the Church can be quite destroy'd, so as to have no manner of Being in the World, as it had not, before it first began to be; or, Secondly, It may signify only not to be the same Church, as to *Doctrine*, - *Worship*, and *Polity*,

Polity, which was founded by Christ, and finish'd by the Apostles, but to be corrupted and deprav'd more or less, in one, or more, or all those Parts of its Constitution. In the former acceptation of the Word, *perish* signifies to cease to be at all, or to have Existence in a *Metaphysical Sense*, as Cities and Colleges do, when they are disfranchised or disincorporated ; or as Kingdoms, when they are absolutely destroyed and turned into Democracies or Commonwealths. But in the latter sense, it means no more than that the Church ceases to be a sound, rightly constituted, or Apostolical Church in one or more Parts of its Constitution ; so that a *Catholick Christian cannot communicate in it without Sin* ; and this is to *perish*, or be depraved from what it was and ought to be, in a *moral Sense*. Secondly, The Church of Christ may be taken in as large a sense, as *Christianity*, for the whole Universal Church, wheresoever dispersed over the Earth ; or for some part of it greater or less, comprehending one or more Churches, but not the Universal Church: And when the Gentleman will tell me, in which sense he means the Words *never perish*, and in which sense he understands the *Church of Christ*, then I will tell him in which sense I think his Supposition true, and in which I think it is not : * [For I have reason to think that by the *Church of Christ* he only means the *Church of Rome*.]

AFTER his Supposition follows a Question, in these Words: *I desire to know (if the Protestant Church be the true one) where it was many hundreds of Years before Luther?* This, Sir, is not

* I have added this to shew the reason, why I made use of the foregoing distinction.

one, but two Questions, which an accurate Adversary would have rather proposed thus; *I desire to know if the Protestant Church be the true Church?* If so, then *I desire to know where it was many hundreds of Years before Luther?* Here again I must desire to know, before I answer the first Question, what he means by the *Protestant Church?* For there are many *Protestant Churches*, so call'd, whereof some are true, and some are not true Churches; some perfect, and some not perfect Churches; and when he is pleased to let me know what *Protestant Church* he means, then I shall know how to return an Answer. Secondly, As to the phrase *Protestant Church*, it may either signify the Clergy and People of the Church, or the Faith, or Worship, and Polity, and whatsoever else belongs to the Constitution of a Church; and when he is pleased to let me know, that by the *Protestant Church* he particularly means the Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Church of *England*, and not the Succession of Clergy and People teaching and professing that Faith, practising that Worship, and formed into that Polity; then I will tell him where the Church of *England* was many hundreds of Years before *Luther*; or, if he pleases, before the Council of *Trent*, even where the present Faith, Worship, and Polity of the *Roman Church* never was, *i. e. in the Primitive Church*. I say, before the Council of *Trent*, because *Luther* was none of our Reformers; and because I should rather have expected, that a fair and learned Adversary should have said, *I desire to know, where the Church of England, or where your Religion was for many hundreds of Years before the Reformation, or pretended Reformation*, as he might have said without offence. But the Question thus put hath been

so often, and so plainly and fully answer'd, that he must pardon me, if I say I am tempted to think, he purposely disguised it in other uncertain and ambiguous terms.

IN the last place comes his Challenge in these Words: *Name your Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay one single Congregation, or Village of Protestants for 900 or 1000 Years before your Separation from the holy Catholick Church.*

HERE it is, as I observ'd, that the Gentleman begs the Question, or takes for granted what is the greatest Point of Controversy between us, in those Words, *Your Separation from the holy Catholick Church*; whereas we affirm, and most assuredly believe, that our Separation (as he must mean from the Church of Rome) was not a Separation from the holy Catholick Church, but a return unto it from many Errors, Innovations, Abuses, and Corruptions; and whether it were so or no, we are willing to appeal to Catholick Tradition, which consists in *Antiquity, Universality, and Consent.*

2^{dly}, His Challenge is fallacious and sophistical; in asking us to *Name our Bishops, Writers, Churches, &c. in our Reformed Bishops, Writers, and Churches*, before the Reformation, which he calls our Separation; that is to say, he asks us to name our reformed Bishops, Writers, and Churches, before they were reformed; which is as absurd, as to ask us to shew the alteration and change of any other Society or Thing, before it was altered and changed.

SIR, in this way of Challenging, he might as well have bid us name our Protestant Kings and Courts before *Edward VI.* And any Man may as reasonably ask a Sloven, where his clean Face was, for so many Days before it was washed?

Sir, would you not think a Man went to impose upon you, who should ask you, *Where your sound and healthful Constitution after Recovery was all the while you lay sick?* Or of a River, which perhaps in your Ancestor's Days was full of Mud and Weeds, but you had cleansed it with great Cost and Labour, *Where the pure and clean Stream of it was all the while it was foul?* Would you not think he banter'd you, to bid you shew him one *Tun or Hogs-head, or but one single Bucket of such Water, as it now afforded, for I know not how many Years, before it was made clean?* Sir, I have brought these familiar Similitudes to shew you, what a fallacious Challenge the Gentleman hath sent me by you, and how he hath endeavour'd to impose upon you and me in the terms of it. Had it been fairly penn'd, it should have been put in these or the like Words: *Name any Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay one single Congregation or Village of Christians, that professed your Religion for 900 or 1000 Years before your Separation from the Church of Rome;* and if he pleases to put it so, I will give it an Answer; and then desire him to name one Church, Bishop, or Writer, that 900 or 1000 Years ago professed the *Tridentine Faith,* * [or the Creed of Pope Pius IV.]

I say, if he will make his Challenge in those or the like terms, I will accept and answer it; but at present it is sufficient to shew the Fallacy of it, as he wrote, or dictated it to you. In truth, Sir, it is the same Fallacy, that is in the following Syllogism, with which young Sophists in the Schools endeavour to puzzle one anothers Wits.

* I have added these Words, because I intend to print that Creed in English.

Tom

You bought raw Flesh,

You eat the Flesh which you bought,

Therefore

You eat raw Flesh.

SIR, would you not think I was merry, and ludicrous, and not at all serious, if I should make such a Syllogism, or ask you, *Where your roast or boiled Meat was all the while it was raw?* Thus much, Sir, in reference to the *Supposition, Question, and Challenge*, which the Gentlemen sent me by you; and which, I told you before, were nothing to the *Church's Infallibility*, which was to be the Subject of Controversy between us. I confess the *Supposition* relates to the *Indefectibility* of the Church; but neither that, nor any thing else in his Query, as he improperly calls it, relates to the *Infallibility of the Church*. And therefore in requital to his Query, which was nothing to that Subject, I take the liberty to send him some, that are.

I. SEEING the Word *Church* hath * many significations, I desire to know of him the particular limited

* See all these Significations in the following Citation out of the *Confutatio Imperij Papæ in Ecclesiâ*, by Nestorius, Patriarch of Hierusalem; publish'd by the Learned Dr. ALEX. in Latin MDCCII. p. 212.

The Word [*Church*] therefore is taken in two senses; First, Personally, as every Assembly of Men about any common Religion, or Affair. Secondly, Locally, and such are the Places in which we assemble, *i. e.* Temples, Forums, Theatres and Courts. It is taken for a Temple, 1 Cor. chap. 11. *Have ye not houses to eat and to drink in, or despise ye the Church of God?*

limited sense in which it is infallible, or in which of the many senses Infallibility belongs to it?

II. I desire to know, if by the Churches Infallibility, he means that the Church hath always a living infallible Judge; if so, then,

III. I

And chap. 14. *Let women be silent in the Churches; it is a shame for women to speak in the Church; let them ask their husbands at home.* But both these significations, as well Personal as Local, are of two sorts, Civil and Spiritual. I. Civil, such, absolutely speaking, is every Concourse or Company of People, as was that of *Ephesus*, which rushed upon *Gaius* and *Aristarchus*, Paul's Companions, the Town-clerk is said to have dismiss'd that Church or Assembly: Or else the Place it self, as the Forum or Court, where they met. II. Spiritually, and then it signifies an Assembly either lawful or unlawful. Unlawful, indeed, are such as are called by the Canons sinful and schismatical Assemblies, according to that of the Psalmist, *I have hated the congregation of the ungodly.* But the lawful, of which I am going to speak gradually, is First, either of a few in an House, as *salute the Church in their House*, Rom. 16. Or, 2dly, Of many Houses in one Territory, as *praise God in the Churches*; and, 1 Cor. 14. *Who speaks in an unknown tongue edifyeth himself, but he who prophesieth edifieth the Church.* Or, 3dly, Of many Territories into one Bishoprick, as, *The Church of God which is at Corinth*, (1 Cor. 1.) And in the first of the Revolution, *To the seven Churches which are in Asia.* Or, 4thly, It signifies the People or Flock without the Bishop, as in your Citations: *Take heed therefore unto your selves, and unto all the Flock whereof the Holy Ghost has made you Bishops, to feed the Church of God*, Acts 20. and, 2 Cor. 11. *I have robbed other Churches, taking wages.* 5thly, It signifies the Bishops and Presbyters, as in a Synod or Council, mentioned also by you, as in S. Matth. c. 18. *Tell the Church; but if he hears not the Church, let him be unto you as an Heathen.* 6thly, The chief of the Clergy and Laity, as in your Citation, Acts 16. *They being brought on their way by the Church, pass'd over into Phœnicia.* And again, Acts 18. *Going down to Cæsarea, he went up and saluted the Church.* 7thly, It signifies the Churches of many Episcopall Cities under one Metropolis, as Can. 4. Synod. 1. *The Confirmation of those things which are done in the Province, (speaking about the Election of a Bishop) belongs to the Metropolitan; and the whole Province*

III. I would know, whether this infallible Judge be a single infallible Person, or an infallible Senate or Council?

IV. If it be a single infallible Person, I desire to know, *1st*, where he is always to be found, or where his infallible Chair is? *2^{dly}*, Under what Character

vince is said to be one Church. *8thly*, It is taken for many Metropolitan Churches united under one Primate or Exarch, as Can. 34. of the holy Apostles, *It is convenient the Bishops of several Countries should know who amongst them is Chief, not that he should do anything without acquainting them all.* And Can. 9. and 17. of the 4th Council, *If any one is unjustly sentenced by the Metropolitan, or has a Controversie with him, let him appeal to the Exarch, or to the See of CP.* But the Exarchs are such as the Bishops of Ephesus in Asia, of Caesarea in the East, of Heraclia in Thrace, of Thessalonica in Macedonia, of Corinth in Peloponnesus. *9thly*, It is used to signify many National Churches under one, which from the time of the first General Council, were Five in number; (whereas before they were but Three, and Four before the taking and destruction of Jerusalem) and those Five were establish'd by the following Councils. The 6th Can. of the first Council, *says, Let ancient Customs be observ'd. Let the Patriarch of Alexandria have the Authority of all those that are in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, because like usage is observ'd also to the Roman Bishop.* So likewise are the Privileges preserved to the Churches in Antioch, and other Provinces. And that the Bishop of Aelia (or Jerusalem) be honoured according to the Tradition of the Ancients, is determined in the 7th Canon. In the 10th place, The Church is taken for a Synod of these five Patriarchs, in whom the whole Hierarchy is comprehended as in one union and indissoluble Communion among themselves, both as to the Faith, and Profession, and Sacraments, and Spiritual Officers, and as much as may be, in respect of Manners, and form of Government. Of this it is said, *Upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.* And in the 5th to the Ephes. St. Paul says, *The man is the head of the woman, as Christ is the head of the Church. Husbands love your wives, as Christ loveth the Church.* And in 1 Cor. 12. *And has placed them indeed in the Church, first Apostles, secondly Prophets, thirdly Doctors:* And this is properly stiled *The Catholick Church;* or, absolutely speaking, *The Church of God,*

Character or Capacity this Infallibility belongs to him ; And, *3dly*, If he happen to be a secret Atheist, or Heretick, or Simonist, or Sorcerer, much more if he be openly any of these, whether in these cases he still continues Infallible? But if this infallible Judge be a Senate or Council, then,

V. I would know, if it must be a Council of the Universal Church? If so, then,

VI. I would know of him, *1st*, Who hath power to call this Council? *2dly*, Who hath power to preside in it? Or if these Privileges belong to one and the same Person by Christ's appointment? If so, then,

God, the Mother of us all, Christ's perfect Spouse, whose Head Christ is, according to the Apostle, in his Epistle to the Ephes. in the 1, 2, 3, chapters ; and also Gal. 1, Christ is also the only Head, according to Basil the Great, in his Sermon of the Judgment of God ; who after the first Page, considering the Apostle's expression, speaks thus ; *Ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular* ; that is to say, in Him governing and joining every one to the others unto agreement in one, and one only true Head, which is Christ. In the 11th place, the Church is taken by a Synecdoche for any part relating to the whole Church, as in many of your instances ; so the Apostle writing to the Corinthians, acknowledges, that he persecuted the Church of God ; meaning especially the two Churches of Jerusalem and Damascus, because he had raised Troubles in them only, yet intentionally against the whole Catholick Church. And because all the Members being knit together amongst themselves, the whole Body is justly said to share in the suffering of its several Parts, according to that of the Apostle ; *If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it : If one member rejoice, all the members rejoice with it.* Such another place is that, in the first to Timothy the 3d Chap. *I write to thee, O Timothy, that thou manifestest how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the Church of God, which is the Church of the living God, the Pillar and Ground of Truth.* Now Timothy at that time conversed only in the Church of Ephesus, yet his pious Conversation edified the whole Church.

VII. I would know, whether that Council cannot be an infallible Judge, without the Call and Presidency of that Person? If so, then,

VIII. I would know of him, if it should so happen, that the whole Council or the great majority of it should determine one way, and he alone or but with a little minority another, which would be in the right?

Sir, I could ask many more important Questions relating to this Subject of the Church's Infallibility; as *1st*, Whether the same spiritual Judges, if the matter in Controversy were sent to them in Circular Letters, would not be as Infallible in their Determinations, out of a Council, as in one? *2dly*, Whether the resolutions of those who cannot come, but send their Opinions upon the Question in Controversie to the Council, ought not to be regarded in every respect, as if they were present? Sir, There are many more difficult Questions relating to this Subject, but I will but trouble him with one or two more, occasion'd by the Writings of a learned Father of great Authority in the Latin Church, I mean *Vincentius Lirinensis*, in his admirable Book entituled *Commonitoria duo adversus profanas Hæreses Novationes*. He flourished in the Year of God 434. almost Thirteen hundred Years since. And the design of his Book [in those times] was to shew a certain way to determine all Controversies about Faith, which [in his judgment] was * *The Authority of Scripture, and the Tradition of the Catholick Church*, which he makes to consist in *Antiquity, Universality, and Consent*.

* Cap. I. || Cap. III. XXXVII. XXXVIII. XXXIX.
XLII.

THIS he proposes both to private Men and Councils, as the only *sure* way of coming to truth in all Controversies of Faith † *without doubt or scruple*. He, nor the Fathers who wrote * *before him*, ever so much as mention, much less direct, to any living infallible Judge; but to Scripture expounded by *Antiquity*, *Universality*, and *Consent*: and therefore I desire the Gentleman, upon reading that little Book, to tell me, if the Church knew of any living infallible Judge in his Time; or if it did, how he came to be ignorant of it? Or if, as he writes in that Book, Scripture expounded by Catholick Tradition, be a *sure* and certain Rule, whereby to determine all Controversies, then how can there be any need of an infallible living Judge?

To Catholick Tradition, as set forth and explained by him, we appeal, *viz.* to *Antiquity*, *Universality*, and *Consent*.

I appeal to it in this very Controversy of the *Church's Infallibility*, and will be concluded by it. And from this Rule, we shall see whether our Church or yours is *Innovator* in the things, that are in Controversy between them, and which is in the right, and which in the wrong. I join with you in your Prayer, 'That God would strengthen and assist those with his Holy Spirit, who plead his Cause, and bring those to Confusion, who fight against him with subtilty and sophistry.'

I desire, Sir, that your *Sister* may have the deliberate perusal of this Letter by herself, as long and as often as she thinks fit. And if the Gentleman hath a mind to proceed farther upon the subject of Infallibility, I desire it may be in an Oral Conference before your *Sister*, you only be-

† Cap. XXXIX. XLI.

* As Tertullian, Irenæus.

ing present on one side, and my very worthy Friend and Neighbour Mr. Nelson, whom you know, on the other. I find I am not able to write so much, as a Paper-Controversy upon this Question will require, having, as the World knows, much * Work of another nature to do. This is the reason that I desire what you first proposed, that if the Gentleman think fit to go on, it may be in an Oral Conference, in some place where we may have proper Books.

You pretend, Sir, to be very much in haste for fear your Sister should die; she is, God be praised, very well; and such Conferences must not be hurried up in haste for that reason, no more than in former Ages they were wont to precipitate the Instruction of the Catechumens. *De vita hominis nulla est Cunctatio longa.* I am;

S. I R,

Your humble Servant,

GEO. HICKES.

* *Ling. Vett. Septentr. Thesaurus*, &c. in two Books, three Volumes fol. Printed at Oxford, 1705.

The

*The REPLY to Dr. Hickes's Answer,
sent by the Author of it to Mr. G---n,
and transmitted by Mr. G---n to the
Doctor.*

S I R,

March 13. 1704.

I **W**HEN at your entreaty I sent you a *short* Query, concerning the true Church of Christ; to be proposed to a learned Doctor for an Answer; I could not have imagined that there had been in it, either so much ambiguity as to render it incapable of an Answer, or much less any thing to provoke any Man to *Passion and injurious Language*; but such has been the fate of that little Paper. As to the ill Language it is by me unanswerable, only by praying God Almighty to bestow upon him all the true Blessings he can desire, and that it may be my share always to receive, rather than to give in that kind. But as to the fault he finds with the Question, I design to shew you in short, that had there been as much haste in him to answer, as *there is plainness in the Query*, he would not have spent a Sheet of Paper so little to the purpose. And when I have done this, I will endeavour to pick an Answer out of his Words, by which I may begin to frame an Argument or two, towards the ending of the Question; which perchance he will make his study not to understand, lest if he should understand them, he may begin to find that he cannot answer 'em. But first, let us see how he *winks*, that he may not see the meaning of the Words set down in the Query.

II. His

II. His first difficulties are against the ground of my Query, which stands thus; *Supposing this for true, that the Church of Christ can never perish.* I appeal here to any Divine, whether the Words of this Proposition be not clear? Yet here he finds two difficulties. First, he desires to know, what the Word *perish* means; I answer, *To perish is to cease to be,* to lose the Essence the thing had before it perished. A Man perishes when he dies, because he ceases to be a Man: So the Church of Christ should be said to perish, when it should cease to be the Church of Christ. This is the evident, common, obvious meaning of the Word. But, says he, *perish* may be taken in a *moral sense*, to mean (for example) that the Church perishes, when it ceases to be a *sound, well constituted Church.* 1st, Suppose this were true, it's nothing to his purpose; for Words are to be taken always in their properest signification, unless there be some good reason to the contrary. 2^{dly}, It's absolutely false, that the Church may be said to perish, whilst it retains every thing essential to the Constitution of a true Church, tho' at the same time it remains unsound in *some* part of it; any more than a Man can be said to *perish* when he loses a Finger, or falls Sick, or when his Face grows dirty, according to his own phrase. And when he will allow, that every Man perishes that falls into a Puddle, and dirties himself; then I will allow this Exception of his to be pertinent. In the mean time, let him reflect, that in case the Church had been unsound; that doth not amount to perishing, but only to being depraved; nor in such case had she *lost her self*, (which is to *perish*;) but only *her Beauty*, or *her sound Constitution*. Besides, what imaginable reason had he to think that I should take the

Word

Word *perish* for being *unsound* (suppose it could be taken so ?) For, how could I suppose for true, that the Church of Christ could not *grow unsound*, to them, who ground their Reformation upon this very reason, that she *was corrupted and unsound*? Out of all which it appears manifestly, that he had no reason to doubt of the sense of this Word *perish*.

III. His second Cavil is upon these Words, the *Church of Christ*: For, says he, they may be taken in two senses; one as large as *Christianity*; the other for *some part of it greater or less, but not for the universal Church*. Here I might pay him in his own Coin, and ask him, What he means by *Christianity*? whether those Faithful only, that are baptized, as we mean it; or all those, that believe in Christ, whether baptized or no? But not intending to wait for his answer, I must tell him, that both these senses are absolutely false. And first, that the Church of Christ is not taken for all Christianity; I *prove* out of their own Definition of the Church, in the 19th Article of the XXXIX. which says thus; *The visible Church is a Congregation of Faithful Men, in the which the pure Word of God is preach'd, and the Sacraments be duly ministred*. It is but too apparent, that this Definition cannot possibly be applied to innumerable Sects, who neither preach the pure Word of God, nor duly minister the Sacraments. Therefore 'tis false that the *Church of Christ* can be taken to signifie all *Christianity*. Besides, suppose it might be taken in that large sense, yet he had no reason to suspect, but that I took it here for the *true Church only, to which the promises of perpetual Duration were given, and for the One, Holy, Catholick, and Apostolical Church*, (which soever it be) not including such *pitiful Sects*, as
rise

rise and fall in every Age. Therefore it's evident he shut his Eyes here again for fear of seeing the true Sense of the Word. But yet, says he, *The Church of Christ may be taken for one or more particular Churches; but not the universal Church.* Behold, Sir, the disingenuous trifling of this Gentleman, who is resolv'd to take the Word in all other Senses but the right one. Suppose I should say, *the Kingdom of England is a rich and glorious Nation*; see how he would raise Difficulties upon these clear Words, *What means he by the Kingdom of England? Does he mean Somersetshire alone? Or Somersetshire, Wiltshire, and Berkshire? Or England, Denmark, and Norway?* Just so, when I had said, *the Church of Christ cannot perish*; he answers, *What means he by the Church of Christ? One, or two, or more particular Churches? Or the Church of Christ and all Heresies besides?* As if the most extravagant Heresies were a part of the Church; or as if one or two particular Churches were the Church of Christ, and not rather a part of the Church of Christ. But these Gentlemen are grown such Strangers to Christ's Church, that when it is named they lift up their Heads, and know not what it means. Therefore, if he had been so minded, he might easily have known, that by the Church of Christ I mean the holy Catholick Church, which his Creed ought to have put him in mind of.

IV. Now then come we to the Question, which he takes in pieces thus, *I desire to know (if the Protestant Church be the true one); where it was many Hundreds of Years before Luther?* This, says he, is not one Question but two. I refer it to any Man; there is evidently but one Question. But, says he, an accurate Adversary would have propos'd it in two, thus: *I desire to know, if the Protestant Church be the true Church?* If so, I de-
C
sire

fire to know, where it was many Hundreds of Years before Luther? Had I done so, I should have reckoned my self to have been very formally impertinent. For what Reason had I to make a Question of it, whether he would say the Protestant Church was the true one or no? Things so clear are to be supposed, not asked, by all who would not multiply Questions without end; and I do not conceive, why he should be so angry with me for not taking him to be such a Knave, as to be of a Religion which he would not say was the true one. Surely Persons of this Nature may easily find a Pardon.

V. His next crissing is his desiring to know, what I mean by the Protestant Church. For, says he, there be true Protestant Churches, and not true ones. Here, Sir, pray take notice what he has nothing to complain of, but that I gave him too much Liberty; I bid him name any which he will call the Protestant Church, and he has a mind to be confin'd; so that you see a small Subject serves as to wrangle about. But I'm content, let him be confin'd to the Church of England, and shew me where there was a Church holding all the Articles of the Church of England for 600 or 700 Years before Luther. And since the Word Luther gives Offence, let it be blotted out; I'm glad he's so much ashamed of the great Captain and Patriarch of the pretended Reformation, The Chariot of Israel and the Horsemen thereof, as some have been pleas'd to call him, and a most excellent Instrument of God, as great Doctors of his own Church have term'd him. His Name I put down, only because he marks best the great Epoch of the Protestant Religion, by Reason of his Priority in Time and Fame above others. But since he desires it, let his Name be remov'd, and that of

Cranmer's

Grammar's be put down, or any other whom he thinks he needs not be ashamed of.

VI. Yet still he finds more Difficulties in understanding this Phrase, as he calls it, *the Protestant Church*. For, says he, it may either signify the *Clergy and People of the Church, or the Faith, Worship, and Polity of it*. Why had we not this Difficulty started before, when we had the former Dispute about the *Word Church*, that we might have done with it once for all? I defy him to give a Reason, except that the Fanny bit now and not then, or else perchance because he was resolved to have a new *Civil in reserve* for this Place, and when it's done the Difficulty's none. For by the *Word Church* is properly meant a *Congregation of faithful Men, &c.* and this by all sides; so it is in the nineteenth Article of his Church, so it is in all our definitions of the Church, so it is in divers other even heretical definitions of the Church; and I do not remember to have read any where, that Church is taken for the Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Church. And if he have any where read it, yet he ought to reflect that in reason he should have taken it in that Sense, which Divines of all sides take it commonly in, in this Dispute of the Church, viz. *For a Congregation of faithful Men, &c.* and not for the Faith, &c. of these Men. Thus you may guess, Sir, that it is a harder thing to bring this Gentleman to the Bar, and make him speak out plainly *Guilty or not Guilty*, than perchance it would be to convict him, after he had once made his Plea.

VII. Now come we to the last Words of my Paper, which are these, *Name your Bishops, Writers, Churches, any one single Congregation or Village of Protestants for 900 or 1000 Years before*
 C 2 your

your Separation from the Roman Catholick Church, for those are my Words, *Roman Catholick Church,* as is to be seen in the Paper I sent you, and not these, [*Holy Catholick Church*], as he is pleased to mistake ; so there's an end of that Quarrel. Let us now to the purpose. •

VIII. *THIS Challenge,* says he, *is fallacious and sophistical,* in asking us to *Name our Bishops, Writers, and Churches, &c. i. e. Our reformed Bishops, Writers, and Churches before the Reformation.* I'm sure this Answer is sophistical, and a great imposition both upon you and me. Have I any such Words, as *reform'd Bishops, Writers ? &c.* No, but he puts the Question in his own sophistical Words, because he cannot answer it in mine ? What, had they no Bishops or Churches, before they were reform'd ? How did they do then to reform them ? For to *reform* is to give a better Form to something, which before was under a worse. I demanded, where his Church was at all, whether *reform'd* or *deform'd* matters not ? Cannot he tell me, where her *slovenly dirty Face* (according to his own Phrase) once was, because 'tis now washed ? Or is it sophistical to ask a sick Man where he was, when he was well and lusty ? Away, away, *this is too visibly idle.* Let the Gentleman know then, that by the Word *Protestant* I mean Christians professing their Religion ; and I cannot imagine what else he could fancy I meant, except he thought me so foolish, as to take it for *People protesting against the Decrees of the Diet of Spire,* according to the Original Sense of the Word.

IX. Thus far, forsooth, was it necessary to dispute like *Grammarians*, concerning the meaning of clear Words : But, because it's so difficult a Thing to draw him to a direct Answer, I will endeavour to gather one from his Words, which are

are conformable with those of the other Doctors of his Church, who teach that their Church is nothing but ours reform'd; which this Gentleman explains by the Comparisons of *a dirty Face wash'd, a muddy River cleans'd, and a sick Man heal'd*. But I hope to prove to you, that if their Religion were true, our Religion would have been none at all, and consequently incapable of being reform'd; from which I will draw other Consequences of great Importance, and this as briefly as may be, not to be tedious.

X. FIRST then, *It is essential to a true Church of Christ, not to teach and practice Idolatry: But the Roman Catholick Church, according to their Principles, teaches and practises Idolatry*: This they not only grant, but preach in every Pulpit; we commit Idolatry in worshipping an Host; Idolatry in the invocation of Saints; Idolatry in the worship of Images; nay, this very Gentleman told you, that we gave divine Worship to a wooden Cross: *Therefore the Roman Catholick Church, is no true Church of Christ, nor was when they went from it*.

XI. 2^{dly}, I prove it out of the foresaid 19th Article of their own Church, thus, *The visible Church of Christ is a Congregation of faithful Men, in the which the Sacraments be duly ministred according to Christ's Ordinance: But in the Roman Catholick Church, according to their Doctrine, the Sacraments are not duly ministred, &c.* For they hold but two Sacraments; and of those two it's certain, that according to the Protestants, we do not minister the *Eucharist* according to Christ's Ordinance: It remains then that according to that, we minister only Baptism duly, which is but one Sacrament, not Sacraments: Therefore we have not the due Ministration of Sacraments

in our Church; as their own Definition of a Church requires: *Therefore the Roman Catholick Church is not (nor was when they left it) the visible (nor a visible) Church of Christ.*

XII. 3dly, AGAIN, one of the foresaid Article, *The visible Church of Christ is a Congregation of faithful Men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, &c. But in the Roman Catholick Church, according to their Doctrine, the pure Word is not preach'd, nor was when they left it.* For pure is contrary to corrupt, and they teach, that our Doctrine is and was corrupt, and our Religion full of gross and damnable Errors; nay, they give that for the Reason of their pretended Reformation: *Therefore the Roman Catholick Church is not, nor was not, when they went from it, the visible (not a visible) Church of Christ.*

XIII. Thus I have proved, that according to their Principles, the Roman Catholick Church was not a Church of Christ, when they pretended to reform it: From whence it follows, 1st, That no Protestant Church could reform it, no more than one can wash a Face that has no Being; so that they are not a reform'd Religion, but absolutely a *new Religion*, that is a false Religion: For it's evident that their Religion's new, if it was not reformed: But I have proved clearly, that it was not reform'd: Therefore it's evident it is new: Therefore it's evident it is false.

XIV. It follows 2dly, That if the Roman Catholick Church was no Church of Christ, as I have proved it was not according to their Principles, it follows, I say, that the true Church of Christ absolutely perish'd, and was quite destroy'd for many Hundred Years; from whence we may clearly see the Protestant Religions to be all false, from the Truth of which would follow so absurd and blasphemous

phenomenon a Doctrine, as that the Church of Christ was quite destroy'd.

XV. It follows *3dly*, That the Roman Catholick Church is the true Church, for *some Church must be the true Church of Christ, and it can be none, to whom the Promises of indefectibility or perpetual Duration have not been made good*: But those Promises have not been made good to any but the Roman Catholick, and have evidently fail'd all Protestants for the space of 900 or 1000 Years: Therefore the Roman Catholick Church is the true Church of Christ.

XVI. To conclude, Sir, this their Pretence of asserting their Religion from the Imputation of Newness, and consequently of Falsity, by saying it is the same in Substance with ours, is too visibly, false to impose upon any one that will open his Eyes. For they hold but two Sacraments, we hold seven; according to them we commit gross Idolatry, they horrible Impieties and Profanations according to us: We follow the guidance of the Church, they *their own*; which of the one side is the source of many and important Errors. It would be too long to reckon up all the Differences between us, insomuch that it seems clear, that either their Religion or ours is a damnable Heresy; and ~~whethersoever~~ it be, theirs is false. For if our Religion be a damnable Heresy, theirs is a *new one*, as I have proved; and if theirs be a Heresy, it needs no Proof that it's false, and so I conclude.

XVII. Thus, Sir, the Gentleman may see, that what I writ concern'd ~~the~~ *Indefectibility* and not the *Infalibility* of the Church, which I never dream'd of, nor intended, as he is pleas'd to imagine. If he designs an Answer to any thing in this, I desire it may be direct and home to the Point; and if there

be any Word of uncertain Signification; let it be answered by distinguishing according to the Custom of fair and learned Adversaries, and not be sent back with a Number of new Queries to attend it, which is a Fashion newly invented by this Adversary.

XVIII. As to his many Questions concerning the Infallibility of the Church, we will answer them, when we have done with this; in the mean time, let any Impartial Man be our Judge, whether he or I are the less accurate. I, that for a ground of one Query suppos'd a clear Truth, which he dare not deny: Or he, who for one Dispute, has propos'd fifteen or sixteen Points, and several of them of very different Natures, and enough to fill whole Volumes. As for *Vincentius Lirinensis*, we are now actually examining one of his Rules set down in the very Place he cites, where *Vincentius* asserts those only to be Catholicks, who hold what has been believ'd *every where, always, and by all*. And I think I have sufficiently proved, that the Church of *England* has not been *always*. Let us try one Rule at once, which I'm sure those will never be against, who have a mind to speak closely to any one,

If the Gentleman should answer this in the same Stile he did the Query, I suppose you will know how to make a Difference betwixt big Words and great Arguments, betwixt ill Language and good Sense. I am,

S I R,

Your most Humble Servant,

A. B.

Dr.

Dr. Hickes's ANSWER to the Reply
sent from the unknown Author by
Mr. G----n.

C H A P. I.

SUPPOSING *this for true, That the Church of Christ can never perish, I desire to know (if the Protestant Church be the true one) where it was for many Hundreds of Years before Luther? Name your Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay one single Congregation or Village of Protestants, for 900 or 1000 Years, before your Separation from the holy Catholick Church.*

I. SIR, these are the Words of the Paper, which you called your *Query*, as they were sent to me by Mr. G----n in his Letter, in which are these Words. *I here send you, as from him, the above written Query.* I thought it convenient for several Reasons, one of which is my own Justification, to transcribe it in the head of this Answer to your Reply; in which, Sir, you charge me in your VII Paragraph with a voluntary Mistake, in changing the Words *Roman Catholick Church* into *holy Catholick Church*. For if I was pleased, as you speak, to make that Mistake, it was a voluntary and inexcusable Mistake; but it was not my Mistake, but Mr. G----n's, as I can shew from his Letter, and as he himself acknowledged to me; nor had I any Temptation wilfully to mistake the Words. For in your Challenge, name your Bishops, &c. for 900 or 1000 Years before your Separation from the
Roman

Roman Catholick Church, you beg the Question, and take for granted what is the greatest point of Controversy between your Church and ours, as much as if you had said, *your Separation from the holy Catholick Church*. For if the *Roman* be either the *Catholick*, or a *Catholick Church*, we cannot justifie our Separation; but we deny it to be either the *Catholick*, or a *Catholick Church*: This you know to be the Question between us and you, and yet you take it for granted; which among other reasons gave me that occasion to say without any Passion, *that had I not been told you were one appointed to manage the Controversy between your Church and ours, I should rather have thought that your Query, as you call it, had been penned by some Novice*; for one cannot easily imagine, that a Person skilful in Controversy, if he were ingenuous, would make his Query terminate in supposing that to be true, or taking that for granted, which the Respondent neither could, nor could be thought to grant.

II. *adly*, Had I mistaken the Word *Holy* for *Roman*, it had been only a verbal and not a real Mistake; because the *Roman Church*, according to its own Doctrines and Principles, is the *holy Catholick Church*, nay the *† holy Catholick Apostolick Church*, as I told Mr. G——, when he begged pardon for his Mistake. And therefore, Sir, I could have no design in making the Mistake, had it been mine, because it would have been of no Advantage to me; but it is of some Advantage to you to suggest to your Profelyte, as if I had wilfully mistaken it; and therefore you

† *Bulla Huiusmodi* IV. super forma Juramenti professionis fidei. Laud against Fisher § 28. n. 26. But A. C. tells us it is to be learned of the one holy Catholick; Apostolick, always visible and infallible Roman Church.

must

must give me leave to add, that you have not cleared your self from the dishonourable Charge of *begging the Question*, which is a† common Practice among you, and *for there is not an end of that Quarrel*, (I use your Words) as you confidently affirmed to your Profelyte there was.

III. IN your XVII. Paragraph you lay another mistake to my Charge, of the *Infallibility* for the *Indefectibility* of the Church. But neither was that mistake, if it was one, mine, but Mr. G——'s; who first desir'd we might have a Conference before his Sister of *Transubstantiation*, and then some Days after came to tell me, that the Gentleman, as he styled you, desired it might be of the *Infallibility* of the Church. When I told him of this, he could not deny it, nor do I suppose he will deny it now. And perhaps he may remember, when he said *the Infallibility of the Church*, that I asked him, if it was the *Infallibility* or *Indefectibility* of the Church? To which he answered, *The Infallibility of the Church*. And therefore when I saw the Query you sent me in order to our Proceeding, as Mr. G—— said in his Letter, I gave it as the first Reason in my Answer to it, why I thought it drawn up by some *Novitias*, because it was nothing to the purpose of *Infallibility*, the Subject in which I thought we were to be engaged. In another part of my Letter there were these Words: *I confess the Supposition relates to the Indefectibility of the Church, but neither that, nor any thing else in his Query, as he improperly calls it, relates to the Infallibility of*

† Nestoril Patriarchæ Hierosol. confutatio imperii Papæ. London MDCCCL p. 63. Atque equidem ex inscriptione à primâ paginâ falsam tuam suppositionem confutabo. scil. eam, quam prius debuisti firmè probare, ut confessam assumpsisti, Et nunc, Et in sequentibus.

the

the Church. Methinks these Expressions written with such an appearance of Simplicity, might have obliged you to ask Mr. G-----, what he told me the Subject was to be, upon which you invited me to a Conference, before you had charged me with a wrong Imagination of it, and by Consequence with a very great Impertinence, in sending you so many Queries relating to a Subject, which was not to be the Matter of Controversy between us. How this Mistake happened between you and him, you best know, and whether it was designed or no. But if Infallibility was to be the Subject of Controversy between us, I think first I had as much Right to send you those Queries relating to it, as you to send me a *Complex Query*, which I neither desired nor expected from you; and therefore to use the Words in your XVIII. Paragraph, *I am willing that any impartial Man should be Judge between us; whether you or I were less accurate*, or if you please less impertinent; you, who under the name of one plain Query sent me *many*, attended with a *Supposition* and a *Challenge*; or I, who sent you many single, plain, distinct Queries relating to what, I really thought, was to have been the Subject of Controversy between us. All the Answer you think fit to give them is this, *We will answer them when we have done with these*; and then you say, that *there are 15 or 16 Points before one Dispute, and several of them of very different Natures, and enough to fill whole Volumes.* I will not tell you in your own Words, that *this is trifling, nor that it is a hard Matter to bring you to the Bar, &c.* But you must give me leave to tell you, that all those Queries you call *Points*, are all Points to the Subject of Infallibility, and directly relate in their different Natures to it; and that

that they are so far from requiring Volumes to answer them, that you might have made a distinct Answer to them in as small a Compass as I proposed them. Was it for Instance so tedious a Matter to have answered *Yes* or *No*, to the Question in which I asked you, whether by the Church's Infallibility you meant, that the Church hath always a living infallible Judge? Or to have told me, whether that living infallible Judge was a single Person, or a Senate or Council? and if a single Person, where he was always to be found, where his infallible Chair was? or if the Church knew of any infallible Judge, in the time of *Vincentius Lirinensis*? or if it did, how he came to be ignorant of it? Plain simple Answers to such plain simple Questions would not have taken up much Paper, or much of your time, had you been disposed to make them. And as for my Questions, I had not proposed them, but that sincerely believing the Infallibility of *the Church* was to be the Subject of Controversy between us, I was willing to put you in remembrance by them of the great, and give me leave to tell you, I think, insuperable Difficulties with which that Doctrine is attended; and shew your Profelyte that *the Infallibility of the Church* (by which you still precariously mean the Church of *Rome*) is itself so far from being certain, that it is one of the greatest Controversies that ever was among Christians, not to be proved by Scripture and Catholick Tradition, or *Antiquity, Universality, and Consent*. You your self acknowledge, *there are 15 or 16 disputable Points in it of different Natures, and enough to fill whole Volumes*; How then can a Doctrine so full of disputable Points be clear and certain, or the Church that pretends to it be the Guide of Faith? For this reason I desired, that

that your Presbytery might have the deliberate perusal of my answer to your Query, thinking that you might have begun with her at that Doctrine; which if it could be proved, would be a compendious way of ending all Controversies in Religion, especially those between our Church and yours, and the most speedy and effectual means that can be taken of reducing us to your Fold. This Consideration, methinks, should have made you embrace the Opportunity, which the mistake gave you, of preferring the Subject of the *Infallibility* to that of the *Indefectibility of the Church*, if you thought it to be a clear Christian Verity. But you have promised to consider it hereafter; and then I will expect a Solution of all the Difficulties which lie wrapt up in my Queries, and of all those which are expressed in a Letter of Mr. *Chillingworth* to Mr. *Leugar*, concerning the Church of Rome's being the Guide of Faith, printed with his Book entitled *The Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation*, 1687. As also in the Preface of a Book published since I received your Answer, which is intitled *German Religionism*, printed at Oxford in 8^o 1704. Perhaps you may know the Man, who began the Dispute, in six Queries, with the learned Author of that Book. His way of Writing and yours are very much alike in complex and capacious Queries, in joining the Socinians and Protestants together; in changing your Adversary with Cavils, Contradictions, and protracted Distinctions; in under-valuing of him and his Answer, in confident Expressions, and treating of him with unkind Language. Mr. *Chillingworth*, in his Letter before mentioned, makes the same Objection against *Infallibility* that I do, from *Vincentius Lirinensis*; to which in your answer you make this Reply in your XVIII. Paragraph.

Paragraph. As for Vincentius Lincolniensis, we are now actually examining one of his Rules set down in the very place he cites, where Vincentius asserts those only to be Catholick, who hold what hath been believed every where, always, and by all; and I think I have sufficiently proved, that the Church of England hath not been always. Sir, give me leave to tell you, that you have examined Vincentius to little purpose, if you can make no better a Reply. For, first you call that one of his Rules, which is his only Rule of expounding Scripture, and of determining Controversies in Religion; and that is to believe and embrace whatsoever hath been taught and delivered by all, every where, and always (or at all times) in the ancient Catholick Church. This in the same Chapter, he calls following Univerſality, Antiquity, and Consent. And he ſaith again and again, that we ought to believe all Doctrines to be Catholick, and to believe them to be ſuch without any Doubt or Scruple, that have that Teſtimony. And in my Answer to that Query, I appealed to it, and offered to be tried by it. And you had done but like a fair and generous Adverſary, to tell your Proſelyte you would join iſſue with me, either in putting me upon the proof that our Confessions and Doctrines (to prevent Cavil again I muſt add our poſitive Doctrines) have that Teſtimony, or in offering to prove that yours had. But inſtead of this you ſay, that the Church of England has not been always or at all times. No indeed, Sir, you are in the right, it hath not been always, neither as a former; nor a reformed

† Cap. ii. Hoc eſt verè proprièque Catholicum. Cap. xxxvii. Id pro indubitato, certo, ratòque habeatur. Cap. xli. Id verum & Catholicum uſque ullo ſcrupulo judicetur.

Church;

Church; nor hath the Church of *Rome* been always either as a formed, or a deformed Church. But what then? May not a Church be Catholick, that was not always or at all times from the beginning of Christianity, if it teaches and holds all Catholick Doctrines, that Antiquity always taught in all Churches with one Consent? According to your reasoning; a Church cannot be a Catholick Church, because it was not always; then there never was any Catholick Church, but that of † *Jerusalem*, which was the first of all Christian Churches. Nor could the Church of *England*, which you suppose to be an heretical and schismatical Church, by consequence from your Answer, become or recommence Catholick, although she should (which God forbid) return to your Church. Had I been admitted to an oral Conference with you before your Profelyte, I should have shew'd the Weakness of your Answer in this Reply; I would have shew'd you, how contrary it was to the reasoning of * *Tertullian*. But any pretended Answer was to serve the turn. She was not to wait a few Months for the Issue of the Controversy [between us]; she might dye, as her Brother said, in the mean time: She was in haste to be gone. Pray, good Sir, did you make the foresaid Answer for her use about the Church of *England* in haste, and through oversight, or no?

† Luke 24. 47. Acts 1. 4.

* *Turtul. de præscriptione Hæretic. Cap. 31. Ad hanc itaque formam probabuntur ex illis Ecclesiis, quæ licet nullum ex Apostolis, vel Apostolicis Auctorem suum proferunt, ut multo posteriores, quæ denique ac quotidie instituantur, tamen in eadem fide conspirantes, non minus Apostolica deputantur, pro consanguinitate Doctrinæ.* In this manner will they be tried by those Churches, which though they cannot shew any Apostle or Apostolick Man for their Founder, as being much later, and founded every Day; yet agreeing in the same Faith, are reputed not less Apostolical for the Consanguinity of their Faith.

If

If it was in haste and through oversight, however, it ought to be matter of Humiliation to you ; but if you did not make it in haste and by oversight, it was from a worse cause, which I will not name, or if I did, should it provoke me to return your own Words in the Conclusion of your IV. Paragraph, which I cannot yet bring my self to repeat, though I think it no indecency to put you in remembrance of them. For the reason why I ask this plain Question is, because after you had said, *you had proved the Church of England was not always*, you add with an Assurance, as well as a Reflection upon me, which my Answer did not deserve, *Let us try one Rule at once, which I am sure those will never be against, who have a mind to speak clearly to any one.* Here you apparently split *Vincentius's one Rule*, which, to use your own Words, consists of *every where, always, and by all* ; and this *one Rule* is a Test of Doctrines, which all Churches ought to believe, at what time soever formed or reformed : But you make it a Test for the Age of a Church, or for the time of its being formed or reformed ; implying that a Church which was not *always*, cannot be Catholick ; and if you had split that excellent Father's *one Rule*, in reference to place, as you do to time, to try our Church by, you might by the same Logick have observed to as little purpose, that it hath not been *every where*.

C H A P · II

THERE are many such particular Answers, and other passages unworthy of you, scattered about in your Reply, which I must take notice of [by themselves] that I may not seem
D to

to omit any thing, before I come to answer the more principal parts thereof.

I. First THEN, I must observe how ill you acquit your self of the Charge of sending me a *manifest* Query, under the Name of *one* in terms of uncertain Signification; nay of sending under that Name a Supposition and a Challenge, as well as a Query, to which you answer nothing, in defence of your self for putting a Challenge to your Query. And as for the *Supposition*, you only say in the XVIII. Paragraph, that *you supposed a clear Truth for a Ground of one Query, which I dare not deny*. Whether I dare deny your Supposition in your sense to be a clear Truth, shall be seen by and by; but in the mean time, my Charge of your want of Skill and Accuracy, as I then thought, in sending me three things so different under the Name of a Query, would rest upon you; but that I now find by your Reply, it was not want of Skill and Accuracy, but want of something else, that made you couch so many things in the Lines you call'd your Query. And therefore, Sir, I beg your Pardon for saying, that *had I not been told you were appointed by your Superiors to manage the Controversy, I should have thought it had been penned by some Novice*: I say, Sir, I beg your Pardon for that Mistake, which proceeded from my Charity: But now I find it was drawn up by a *Veteran* (or as I have now just reason rather to say) a *Veterator* in Controversy, who knew how to embroil and perplex, to contrive Snares and Fallacies; to make plain things intricate, by involving many things in one, which were to be separated, in order to a distinct Answer; and by expressing them in Terms of ambiguous and uncertain Signification, to prevent coming to a close Dispute.

pute. You say, you supposed a clear Truth for the Ground of one Query; but why then did you call your Farrago of a Supposition, of a Question, and of a Challenge, a Query? Why must one part of, your *Melange* give a denomination to the whole? And why did you not say, that you added your Challenge as a Superstructure of your one Query, as well as premised your Supposition for the Ground thereof? At this rate you might have joined what you would with it under the Name of Grounds, and Superstructures, and Butterelless, and other terms of Building; you might as well have premised another Query, as a ground to your one Query: But why do I say as well? for it had been better to do so, and more like a fair and a generous Scholastical Adversary, and by consequence more for your Honour to propose things distinctly; and if I do not mistake your Reply, which is not written with Perspicuity, all that you propose as matter of Controversy between us, is contained in these following Queries, which you might have penned thus, or to this purpose. Sir, I desire to know, 1st. If the one holy Catholick Church of Christ can perish? If not, then, 2dly, I desire to know, if the Roman Church from which you separate, be not that one holy Catholick Church? 3dly, I desire to know, if the being of it, as a Church, can consist with such Errors, Innovations, Abuses, and Corruptions, as you charge it with? If not, then, 4thly, I desire to know, if it was no Church, or in other terms not a Church of Christ, when you pretendd to reform it? If so, 5thly, I would know, how a Reformation could be made of no Church, or of a Church that had no being? Or how you could reform that into a Church, which was not a Church of Christ? Lastly, If the Church of Rome was

no Church, or not a Church of Christ, when you reform'd it; then I would know, how your Church can be a reformed Church? Or your Religion a reformed Religion? For you could not reform what was not; therefore your Religion is not a reformed Religion, but absolutely a new Religion, i. e. a false Religion. Sir, all that is in the best part of your Reply to my Answer, may be reduced to these points, and all the Strength of it (if it may call so much Weakness Strength) is contained in them; and had you sent me these, or the like distinct and plain Queries according to the Laws of Controversy, you should have had a speedy and clear Answer to them; but instead of such Queries you sent me a Medley, manifold, and confused Query, in Words of uncertain Signification, on purpose to confound the Controversy, to cast a Mist before the Eyes of your Female Profelyte, and to imploy me in separating one part of it from another, and distinguishing the ambiguous Terms, in all the parts of it, into their several Significations, that I might not come immediately to the Merits of the Cause, and a close and solid Dispute.

II. I shall consider the most material part of your Reply, which I think may be reduced to those Queries, before I have done; but I must go on in answering the scattered Passages of your Reply, [which for method's sake I am forced to separate from the rest] and first of all I must take notice of the special part of your mongrel Query, I mean *the Question which lies intrenched between the Supposition and the Challenge in these Words: I desire to know (if the Protestant Church be the true one) where it was many hundred Years before Luther?* This I told you, was not one, but two Questions, which an accurate Adversary would have proposed

sed thus, *ist.* I desire to know, if the Protestant Church be the true Church? If so, then I desire to know, where it was many hundred Years before Luther? To this Charge you reply nothing in your first Paragraph, but only call it a *short Query*, which you could not imagine had so much of ambiguity in it, as to render it incapable of an Answer, you should have added, without so much distinguishing. But, Sir, the Secrets of your Imagination are best known to your self; and if my Imagination may be set against yours, I cannot but imagine that you, who were the *Strophe Inventor*, the *Dolifabricator*, the crafty Architect of all that Ambiguity, must needs be conscious of it, both when you contrived your Query, and when you read my Answer to it. Do you not plainly see, that the Parenthesis in it, *viz.* *If the Protestant Church be the true one*, is itself one Query? And then the other part, *where it was many hundred Years before Luther*, you will not deny to be another; If you do not discern the Parenthesis of your short plain Query [as you call it] to be a Query, or contain the Nature of a Question in it; it is, to return your own Words, because you *wink so hard*, you will not see it. All indifferent Persons that have but good natural Logick, and much more those who have learned the Artificial, will discern it at first sight. But, Sir, to help your Imagination a little, I will beg leave to illustrate the *plural Nature* of your Query with some others of the like sort, in matters of a different Nature. *e. g.* Sir, *I desire to know (if Episcopacy is of divine Right) whether it was immediately instituted by Christ.* In this Query, as in yours, there are apparently two Questions, one imply'd in the Parenthesis, *If Episcopacy is of Divine Right*; and the other

expressed, whether it was immediately instituted by Christ? And the Respondent to whom this complex plural Query is proposed, must give it two distinct Resolutions. First, by answering, that Episcopacy is or is not of Divine Right, and then that it was or was not immediately instituted by Christ. Such a Query also is this, that must require two distinct Answers, and by Consequence be a double Query; Sir, I desire to know (if the Carthusians are Monks) who was the Founder of the Order? And this also; Sir, I desire to know (if the Cardinals are Dignitaries of the Roman Church) when the Dignity of the Cardinalate began? Thus it is easie to couch two or more Queries in one, and it is allowable in many ways of Writing for brevity sake. But to do so in strict Controversy, you know, Sir, is always counted base and dishonourable, against the Rules of Logick, and the Honour of all Disputes for Truth. I thought fit to premise these parallel Questions in my justification, before I took notice of what you say in your IV. Paragraph. There maintaining your Query to be but one, you say, Now come we to the Question, which he takes in peices. This saith he, is not one Question but two; I refer it to any Man, there is evidently but one Question. And, Sir, I am so willing to refer it to any Man, that I intend to make all Men Judges of this and every thing else in Controversy between us; and so let my willingness to refer it, be as good an Argument as yours. Then say you, if I had proposed it in two Questions, I should have reckoned my self to have been very formally impertinent. For what reason had I to make a Question of it, whether he would say the Protestant Church was the true one or no? Things so clear are to be supposed not asked, by all
 who

who would not multiply Questions without end. But I am sure, Sir, this Reply of yours is very formally impertinent. *First*, Because you know I excepted against the complex Phrase of *the Protestant Church*, telling you that there were many Protestant Churches, of which some were true, and some not true Churches; and therefore you could not but question, whether I would say so improper a thing, as that the *Protestant Church* was the *true one*, when I had shewed you the Improprity of the Phrase, wherein you speak of many independent Churches of different Re-formations and Communions, as if they were one. *Secondly*, You could not in reason suppose, I would say or allow it, though you had put the Question of the Protestant Church of *England*. For to say *the Protestant Church of England is the true one*, is either to suppose there is no other Protestant Church, or that it only is the true Protestant Church, which are equally false and absurd. But, *Thirdly*, if you had no Reason to make it a Question, whether or no I would allow *the Protestant Church to be the true one*, why did you put it without Reason in these Words, *if the Protestant Church be the true Church?* Every *if* implies a Doubt, and every Doubt implies a Query or Question; and therefore it is all one to ask, *I desire to know (if the Protestant Church be the true one) where it was many hundred Years before Luther?* As to say in two Question, *I desire to know, whether the Protestant Church be the true one; and if it be, where it was many hundred Years before Luther?* The former Query calls the Truth of the Protestant Religion as much into Doubt, and makes a Question of it, as much as the two latter. And there is no other difference between them, but that the Que-

tion is exprest in the one, and implied in the other. Would you not think, Sir, I called your Honesty in question, if I should say, *I desire to know (if you are an honest Man) when you'll pay me what you owe me?* Fourthly, You ought as much to suppose, that I believe and would affirm the Protestant Religion to be a thousand Years older than *Luther*, as that I believe it to be the true one; for it cannot be the true one, unless it is as old as the time of the Apostles: And therefore if such a Supposition was a good Reason, why the Parenthesis, *if the Protestant Church be the true one*, was not a Question, then it is as good a Reason against the whole Query; and so you asked nothing, you made no Question, but supposed all. To conclude in your obliging Words, *If you could not take me to be such a Knave, as to be of a Religion, I would not say was the true one*; surely you could not take me to be so much a Fool and Knave too, as to be of a Religion which I did not think to be as much older than *Luther*, as *St. Peter* himself was. I assure you, Sir, I would not be of a Religion, which I did not know and believe to be as old, as the Christian Faith; and therefore I can never be of yours.

III. BUT 2dly; to shew you the *secundity* of your Query, and how many others it hath in the Belly of it, I put you in mind, that there were many Protestant Churches of different kinds; and that before I could answer your Query, I must ask you (as I thought the Laws of Logick and Disputation obliged me) what Protestant Church or which of the Protestant Churches you meant? And when you explained your self, I told you I would return an Answer. This I did to shew that your Query, besides that comprehended in the
Paren-

Parenthesis, had as many more Queries in it, as there were Protestant Churches, true or false, perfect or imperfect, heretical or not heretical, of the same or different Reformations. And to this you have nothing to reply, but, 1st, *That it is trifling.* 2^{dly}, *That I had nothing to complain of, but that you gave me too much Liberty.* 3^{dly}, *That you bid me name any which I would call the Protestant Church, but that I had a mind to be confined.* And lastly, *that you are content to let me be confined to the Church of England.* In Answer to the first, I say, that my desiring to know what Church you meant by the Protestant Church, was not trifling, as you modestly call it, but observing the Laws of Controversy and the Rules of Disputation; according to which, no ambiguous Term can be defined, before it is distinguished into its various significations, nor any ambiguous Question answered, till it is known in which of its Senses it was proposed. To the second I say, that what you miscall Liberty, was sophistical Ambiguity; of which, though I exposed it, I did not complain, otherwise than by saying your Query was not penned; as one would have expected it from a fair and learned Adversary; and if the Laws of Disputation and Controversy be such as just now mentioned, I had reason to say so, and now I say it again. To the third I answer, it is not true, that you bid me name any Protestant Church; where did you bid me name any, or by whom? Not in your Query, nor in any Letter, nor by any Message after I received it. And whereas you say, I had a mind to be confined; I answer, it was I that was to confine you by the Rules of Logic and Disputation; and when you saw I would confine you, then in the last place you are graciously pleased to say, you are contented

tentented to let me be confined to the Church of Eng-
 land. And seeing I have forced you to confine your
 loose Query to that Church, I shall, before I
 have done, shew you by Gods Assistance, where
 there was a Church that held all the Articles of
 the Church of England, nine hundred or a thou-
 sand Years ago. But, Sir, to shew you how
 weak and really trifling your Reply is, let me
 put the Case, that a Gentleman should send the
 following Query to a King at Arms: Sir, I de-
 sire, to know (if I am qualified to be admitted to the
 honourable Order of Knighthood) what it would
 cost me to be created a Knight? As I put this
 Case better for the illustration of the Case be-
 tween us, allow me to suppose the King at
 Arms sent him this Answer. Sir, your Question
 is not one, but two, which you should have pro-
 posed thus. Sir, I desire to know, if I am qua-
 lified to be admitted to the honourable Order of
 Knighthood; and if I am, secondly, What it would
 cost me to be created a Knight? Besides, Sir, there
 are several Kinds or Orders of Knighthood, and of
 different Dignities and Charges; and before I can
 answer these Questions, I must know what Order
 of Knighthood you mean. But to carry on the
 Parallel, I must in the third Place suppose the
 Gentleman made him this Reply. Sir, your An-
 swer is trifling, in desiring to know what Order of
 Knighthood I meant. I gave you too much Liber-
 ty, I bid you name any which you would call an Or-
 der of Knighthood, but you had a mind to be con-
 fined. I see a small thing will serve you to wren-
 gle about, but you may if you will confine your
 self to the most noble Order of the Garter. Sir,
 you know for whose sake I have made this Apo-
 logue, and you cannot but guess to whom I
 leave the Application,

IV. To

IV. To your Query, *Where the Protestant Church was 900 or 1000 Years before Luther?* I made this Answer, That if by the Protestant Church you meant the Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Church of England, I would tell you where the Church of England was many hundred Years before Luther; or if you please, before the Council of Trent, even where the present Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Roman Church never was, *i. e.* in the Primitive Church. I told you I said before the Council of Trent, because Luther was none of our Reformers; and because I should rather have expected, that a fair and learned Adversary would have said, *I desire to know where the Church of England, or where your Religion was for 900 or 1000 Years before the pretended Reformation?* as I told you, you might have said without Offence. To this you reply without any Answer, *Since the Word Luther gives Offence, let it be blotted out.* I am glad he is so much ashamed of the great Captain and Patriarch of the pretended Reformation, the Chariot of Israel, and the Horseman thereof, as some have been pleased to call him, and a most excellent Instrument of God, as great Doctors of his own Church have termed him. His Name I put down only because he makes the great Epoch of the Protestant Religion, by reason of his Priority in Time and Fame above others. But since he desires it, let his Name be removed, and that of Cranmer's be put down, or any other whom he thinks he needs not be ashamed of.

BUT pray, Sir, who told you I was ashamed of Luther? Or by what Inference do you prove I was? I only meant to shew how absurd it was in you to ask of a Doctor of the Church of England, whom you had challenged as such, where the Protestant

Protestant Religion was before *Luther*? Because, as I told you, *Luther* was none of our Reformers; and I will now add what was implied in that Remark, That ours and the *Lutheran* are different Reformations; which made me tell you, I expected that you should have put the Question to me about the Church of *England*, which as you know, differs from all the *Lutheran* Churches in one Point of Doctrine, and in Polity or Government from some. But you could not forbear shewing your Rancour against the Instrument, which God raised up to expose the Corruptions of your Church, and to persuade so great a Part of the Northern World to shake off the Papal Tyranny, which neither we nor our Fathers were able to bear. Father *Paul* only wanted his Courage to do the same on the other Side the *Alps*; and he used to wish that God had given him the Spirit of *Luther*, and sometimes wept to think he had it not. You shew your Rancour also against Archbishop *Cranmer*, and against all our Reformers, in your Letter of the 10th of last *April*, which is nothing to the Merit of the Controversy, nor serves for any Purpose, but to invite me to put you in Remembrance of the monstrous Wickedness of many of your * Popes, which I could shew out of your own Writers. One of which, † Cardinal *Turrecremata*, saith of Pope *John XII.* (whom *Palatina* calls *John the XIII.*) *That because his Life was detestable and wonderful offensive to Christian People, Christ himself gave out the Sentence of Death against him: For when he was in the Act of Adultery with another Man's Wife, the*

* See *Tortura Torti*, p. 219.

† *Summa de Ecclesia*, Lib. 2. cap. 103.

Devil struck him suddenly, and so he died without Repentance.

V. IN the XVII. Paragraph you say: *If he designs an Answer to any thing in this Reply, I desire it may be direct and home to the point.* By this time I hope you are convinced, that I designed an Answer to every thing in it, tho' to the great loss of my precious time; and that you begin to be sensible how direct and home it is in every part to the point. Then you proceed: *If there be any Word of uncertain signification, let it be answered by distinguishing according to the Custom of fair and learned Adversaries, and not be sent back with a number of Queries to attend it, which is a fashion newly invented by this Adversary.* This you say to suggest to your Proselyte and her Brother, as if I had not rightly and fairly distinguished your Query into two; and then by observing that there were several different Protestant Churches, shewed that each of them was really as many Questions, as there were different Protestant Churches, which you notwithstanding absurdly and fallaciously call the Protestant Church. And therefore, Sir, to answer you *directly and home to the point*, I must plainly tell you, that bare Suggestions and Affirmations without Proof against my Distinctions, as if they were not according to the Custom of fair Adversaries and the Laws of Controversy, is a Proof that they were. Here you only suggest, or suppose they were not; in some places you affirm your Query was but one, and a short one, tho' prefaced with a Supposition, and backed with a Challenge; and in another place, already taken Notice of, you refer it to any Man to judge whether it was one Query or two. But these are
no

not Arguments against any Distinctions, which I have here proved to be fair, and just, and necessary by the Rules of Logic and Disputation, to shew the complex and intangling Nature of it. And whereas you tell your Disciples, that returning Queries to Queries is a Fashion newly invented by me, you impose upon their Understandings, and abuse their Credulity. For there is nothing more common in Controversy, than for one Adversary to return Queries for Queries to another; especially to an Adversary, who proposes ambiguous, captious, and sophistical Queries. This is often necessary to shew an Adversary the fallacies of his Queries, or others the Impertinence of them, or to obviate some Design he had in proposing of them, or to chastise his Confidence, and silence him by a Query of the like Nature; and not to mention others, you may find this Fashion much used by Mr. Chillingworth in his Safe way, and Conference with *Leugar*. But what need I name Mr. Chillingworth? A greater than he, a greater than *Solomon*, to guard against entangling Questions, return'd Queries to Queries. *Math.* XXI. 23, 24, 25, XXII. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20.

VI. In your tenth Paragraph you tell your Disciples, I said that *you gave Divine Worship to a wooden Cross*. It is true, Sir, I did say that *you gave Divine Worship to a material Cross*; and I said it to them, and offered to prove it, but they declined it. And that neither you or they may think I cannot make my saying good, I here undertake the Proof of it, out of the Roman *Pontifical de Benedictione novæ Crucis*, where after the solemn Consecration of a material Cross or Crucifix by Incense, holy Water, and Prayers, it is said in the

the Rubrick, *tum Pontifex flexis ante Crucem genibus, ipsam devotè adorât, & osculatur; idem faciunt, quicumque alii voluerint*: then the Bishop kneeling before the consecrated Cross, devoutly adores and kisses it, and as many as will, may do the same. So in the Rubrick of the *Ordo ad recipiendum processionaliter Imperatorem*. *Cruz Legati, quia debetur ei Latria, erit a dextris, & Gladius Imperatoris a Sinistris.* † Here I observe, that the *Worship signified by Latria is due to the material Cross*: But *Divine Worship is signified by Latria*: Therefore *Divine Worship is due to the material Cross*. The *Major* is evident, for the Cross of the Pope's Legat is a material Cross, as the Emperor's Sword is a material Sword; and the *Minor* needs no Proof to Roman Priests, who know the special Sense of *Latria* for Divine Worship, in their own Church, and among their own Writers, as well as among the Greeks. To this agree your Churches *Invocations* of and addresses to the *material Cross* in the Roman Breviary.

* *O Crux ave spes unica
Hoc passionis tempore!
Pis adauge gaudium,
Resque dele Crimina.*

*Nobile lignum exaltatur.
Christi fides rutilat,
Dum Crux ab omnibus veneratur.*

† To this add the Rubrick of the Missal, in *Serâ vi. de pas-
casce*, beginning with these words: *Completis orationibus,
Sacerdos, &c.*

* In sabbato ante Dominicam passionis. In Festo inventio-
nis Crucis. In Festo exaltationis Crucis.

This

THIS Address is made to the *Arbor decora
& fulgida*, &c. the beautiful and resplendent Tree,
upon which our Lord hung.

*Crux fidelis inter omnes
Arbor una Nobilis,
Sylva talem nulla profert;
Fronde, flore, germine.*

Elette ramos Arbor alta;

*Sola digna tu fuisti
Ferre mundi victimam, &c.*

*O Crux signum triumphale!
Mundi vera salus vale.
Inter ligna nullum tale,
Fronde, flore, germine.
Medicina Christiana,
Salva sanos, agros sana:
Quod non valet vis humana,
Fit in tuo nomine.*

THIS Address shews it is the material Cross
you invoke, when kneeling before it you say as
above, or here below.

*O Crux ave spes unica,
In hac Triumphi Gloria
Piis adauge gratiam,
Reisque dele Crimina.*

*O Crux, splendidior cunctis astris, mundo celebris,
hominibus multum amabilis, sanctior universis, quæ
sola fuisti digna portare talentum Mundi: Dulce
lignum, dulces clavos, dulcia ferens pondera: Sal-
va præsentem Catervam in tuis hodie Laudibus
congregatam*

congregatam. Add to these those out of the Missal *Secundum usum Sarum*, part of the English corrupt Worship before the Reformation; *Deus concede propitius, ut qui ad adorandam vivificam crucem adveniunt, à peccatorum suorum nexibus liberentur.* In Exalt. Sanctæ Crucis. Sir, I hope I have now made good my Charge; and I beseech you to be so just, as to translate these Invocations faithfully to your new Convert, for I am ashamed to translate them; and if you can shew me any such Prayers and Addresses to the material Cross upon record in any Office of your or any other Church (to use your own Epoch) 500 or 1000 Years ago, I will be your Proselyte too.

VII. I have not yet taken notice of your first Paragraph, in which you say, when you sent your short Query to be proposed to a learned Doctor (as I presume, you speak Ironically,) you could not imagine there had been either *so much ambiguity in it*, as to render it incapable of an Answer, or much less any thing to *provoke a Man to Passion or injurious Language.* And then you add; *as to the ill Language, it is by me unanswerable, only by praying God Almighty to bestow upon him all the true Blessings he can desire; and that it may be my share always to receive, rather than give in that kind.*

How much Ambiguity there was in your short Query, hath been shewn already; and as the badness of your Cause requires you should shelter it in Ambiguities, and begging the Question, and supposing the Truth of things which are in dispute, and using other Sophistries (as † Ne-

† P. 6, 63, 72, 86, 127, 245, & 249. *Quam varia est ars tua Sophistica, vel hoc solo te veritati non in nutritum apud tuos doctores illa demonstrat.*

Marinus of Hierusalem hath observed it is common for your Writers to do) so, none endeavours to do so more than you. Thus knowing it usual with you by the *Church*, or *the Church of Christ*, or *the true Church*, or the holy Catholick Apostolical Church, to understand *your own Church*; in my Answer to your Query, I desired to know what you meant by *the true Church of Christ* in your Supposition, whether the *universal Church dispersed over the Earth*, or *some part of it greater or less*, comprehending one or more Churches? I put this Question to you, because I perceived you only meant your own Church; and I find I was not mistaken, for in your Reply you say you took it for *the true Church only*, to which the promise of perpetual Duration was given, and for the one holy Catholick, Apostolick Church. Thus in your third Paragraph. But then in your fifteenth you speak more plainly, asserting the Roman Catholick Church (as you call it) to be *the true Church of Christ*, to whom all the Promises of Indefectibility and perpetual Duration have been made good. Now, Sir, this being your meaning, why did you not at first word your Supposition thus? *Supposing this for true, that the Roman Catholick Church can never perish*, I desire to know, &c. Thus plainly proposed, your Supposition had been void of all Ambiguity and lurking meanings, and we had come presently to argue the main Point before your Profelyte and her Brother: But this you durst not do, because you knew I should have told you in my Answer, your Supposition was not true; and that you supposed what, you knew, we could not grant, begging the grand Question between us, and presuming that to be true, which is not only altogether false, but partly absurd,

viz.

viz. that a *Particular* is the *Universal*, and a *most Corrupt* a *Catholick Church*. The like I observed of your Challenge; and finding your *little Paper* ambiguous in all the Parts of it, I was willing to think that Ambiguity proceeded rather from want of Art, than an ill use of it; and therefore I said it looked, as if it was penned by a *Novice* or *some new Convert*; which you in your Letter of *April 10th.* say *that is like a Fool*. But, Sir, is there no difference between being a Fool and a *Novice*, or a recent in Controversy? When *St. Paul* said, *Oportet esse Episcopum non Neophytum*, a *Bishop must not be a Novice* or new Convert, did he mean *not a Fool*? I shew'd my Answer to your Query to several Men of temper, before I sent it to you, only to have their Opinion, whether there was any thing of provoking or undecent Language in it; and they all were of Opinion, there was nothing of that nature therein: But you cry out of *passion and injurious Language*; which I know to be an *Art* among your Writers, to create Prejudice in your *Catechumens* against your Adversaries, as Men of violent Passions, who cannot argue fairly, but instead of Arguments give ill Words, because they find themselves baffled. Nay, they often do so, when they find themselves like to be worsted, that they may have a Pretence to desist. I knew one who accused his Antagonist of ill Language, because he said one of his Propositions was *false*; and for as little Reason you accuse me for saying I thought your Query was written by a *Novice, who was not skilled in Controversy*. But whethet you have not given me provoking, passionate, and injurious Language in ample Measure, inconsistent with your formal Prayer, I appeal to your own Words. *I will endeavour (say you) to pick an*

Answer out of his Words, by which I may begin to frame an Argument or two, which perhaps he will make it his study not to understand, lest if he should understand them, he may begin to find that he cannot answer them. It's evident he shut his Eyes here again, for fear of seeing the true sense of the Word. Let us see how he winks, that he may not see the meaning of the Words in the Query. The dissingenuous trifling of the Gentleman, who is resolv'd to take the Words in all other senses, but the right one. Those Gentlemen are grown such Strangers to Christ's Church, that when it is named they lift up their Heads; and know not what it means. I do not understand why he should be angry with me, for not taking of him to be such a Knave, as to be of a Religion he would not say was the true one. His next Trifling is to know what I mean by the Protestant Church. I am sure this Answer is sophistical, and a great Imposition both upon you and me. I defy him to give a Reason, except the Fancie bit now, and not then——He has resolv'd to have a new Cavil in reserve for this place. It is a harder thing to bring this Gentleman to the Bar, and make him speak out plainly Guilty, than perhaps it would be to convict him, after he had once made his Plea. Away, away, this is visibly idle, it's a difficult thing to draw him to a direct Answer. Thus, Sir, you pray and reproach; bless and persecute; forgive pretended Injuries, and return them at the same time. Give me leave to put that Question of St. James to you, doth a Fountain send out at the same place sweet Water and bitter? And let me put you in mind of what the Satyr said to the Man in the Fable, who blew both hot and cold with the same Mouth. It was for this Reason, that in my Reply to your Letter of April 2. I pray'd you to write, when you

you wrote next, not only with more Care, and Perspicuity, and Propriety of Expression, as it becomes a Controversial Writer; but with more Gravity, and in a more modest Stile, and with more respect to your Adversaries; that in case your Papers came to be published, you might not be obnoxious to the just Censure of the learned, sober, and judicious Men, of all Religions. To this you reply'd, that it had been more modest and just in me to have given my Advice in these terms, *Let us both hereafter write with more Gravity, and in a more modest Stile*; and this, because I was tempted to think by the ambiguous terms in which you penned your uncertain and complex Query, &c. that you were a beginner, who was not much experienc'd in Controversy; and you are offended at me, for my Charity, in thinking that it was want of skill, rather than a worse defect, that made you pen it as you did, beg the question, and suppose things which were not to be supposed; and I fear you will be more offended when I have told you, that your Reply hath obliged me to change my Opinion.

VIII. AMONG other things in it, which I have taken notice of above, give me leave to observe one more which shews you to be a Man of Art. The Challenge-part of your *little Paper*, as you call it, is perin'd in these Words, *Name your Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay one single Congregation or Village of Protestants: for 900 or 1000 years, before your Separation from the holy (mistaken for Roman) Catholick Church.* After I had observed how you begged the question, I also took notice to your Disciple Mr. G----n (for my Answer was written to him) that your Challenge was fallacious and sophistical, in asking me to

name our Bishops, Writers, and Churches, that is, said I, our reform'd Bishops, Writers, and Churches, before the Reformation: which is the same, as if he had asked me to name our reformed Bishops and Churches, before they were reformed; and as absurd, as to ask us to shew the Alteration and Change of any other Society or Thing, before it was so altered and changed. I farther added, that you might as reasonably have asked me to Name our Protestant Kings and Courts before Edward VI. to shew him how captious and tricking your Challenge was. Now in your Reply to this, you say that my Answer is Sophistical, and a great imposition upon you and him, because you had no such Words, as reform'd Bishops and Writers. Say you, have I any such Words as reformed Bishops and Writers? And did I say you had? No, what I said was, that to ask me to Name our Bishops, Writers, and Churches before the Reformation, was the same as to ask me to Name our reformed Bishops, Writers, and Churches before they were reformed. These are not your Words, but as I observed the obvious and plain import of your Words; for no unreformed Writers, Bishops, or Churches can in any propriety of Speech be called Ours. And if you did not design it for a captious Challenge, why did you not, as I took notice, put it in these or the like Terms? Name any Bishops, Writers, or Churches, nay, any one single Congregation or Village of Christians of your Religion for 900 or 1000 Years before your Separation from the Roman Catholick Church. Had you done so, you had had a fair and plain Answer. But this, as you tell your Convert and her Brother, was putting the question (for so you now call your Challenge) in my own sophistical Words, because I could not answer

answer it in yours. But pray, Sir, is there any Sophistry in the Challenge put in my Words? If there is, why did you not shew it? For saying is no proving. Why did you not shew which of the Words are sophistical? Why did you not shew their ambiguous and uncertain signification, which makes them to be fallacious and sophistical, as I have done by all yours. But it is an evident proof, whatever you pretend, you thought them not sophistical; because they have forced you, tho' with an ill grace, to explain your Challenge in the plain, certain, and reasonable sense, which, in my Words, they offer at the first sight. *Let the Gentleman (say you) know then, that by the Word Protestant, I mean Christians professing their Religion.* Do you so, Sir, then the sense of your Challenge is plainly this, *Name any Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay one single Congregation of Christians, that professed your Religion 900 or 1000 Years before your Separation from the Roman Catholick Church.* And here, Sir, I will join issue with you, and answer your Challenge in this sense, after I have premised two or three things in order to a plain and clear Answer to it.

IX. First then, in case I could not name any Bishops, Writers, Churches, or Christian Congregations, that professed our Religion 900 or 1000 Years before our Separation from your Church, it ought to be no Argument against the truth of it, if I can shew that it was professed by all faithful Bishops, Writers, and Churches through all Centuries, from the time of the Apostles to either of those periods. On the contrary, it will be a demonstrable Argument for the truth of it, according to the Rule of *Vincen- tius Lirinensis*, who asserts that, and that only

to be the true Catholick Faith or Religion, which hath the Testimony of Scripture and Catholick Tradition before his time, or which can be proved by *Antiquity, Universality, and Consent*. Secondly, In case I could not answer your Challenge in *Naming any Bishops, Writers, or Churches* that professed our Religion 900 or 1000 Years before our Separation; yet you could make no advantage of it, because you can name none who professed yours, as distinguished from ours, in either of those times. Thirdly, In naming Bishops, Writers, and Churches, that professed our Religion in those or earlier times, I must except the negative Doctrines of our Religion, which you have been told cannot be older than the more modern Errors, which they deny [and against which we protest.] Fourthly, I must also except all Doctrines and Traditions, whether consisting solely in Opinion, or tending to Practice, *which Bishops, Writers, and Churches* may differ in, and yet be and be esteemed of the same Religion, and hold Communion with one another, notwithstanding their different Opinions and Practice [in such Doctrines and Things] such as these was the Doctrine of re-baptizing those, who had been baptized by Hereticks, which was held differently by the † *African Churches*, with some of the * *Oriental Churches*, and the Church of *Rome*, who were of the same Religion and Communion with one another. So the Eastern and Western Church differed in their Opinions

† *Tertul. de Pudicitia, cap. 19. Praescript. adversus Hæret. cap. 12. & de Baptismo. Cyprian LXXIII. Epist. ad Juh. & Epist. LXXI. ad Quintum de baptizand. Hæret.*

* *Firmiliani Epist. ad Cyprian. LXXV. Lombert's Preface before his Translation of Cyprian's Works into French. p. 77.*

and

and Practice, as to the time of *observing Easter* ||; and yet both thought themselves of the same Religion, and lived after some debate in perfect Conicord with one another, as *Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna* did with Pope *Anicetus*. Though Pope *Victor* afterwards was for breaking of Communion with the *Asian* Churches, because they would not keep *Easter* at the time the *Latins* did. Hitherto therefore I may reduce all differences in Churches, as to Liturgies, Ceremonies, Penances, Rituals, Ordinals, Calendars, or number of Festival Days provided they are pure as to Substance, or have no intolerable Errors or Corruptions in them. Likewise all Doctrines, which not being any part of the Christian Faith, or necessarily to be believed or disbelieved in order to Salvation, may be held in the affirmative or negative, without any danger to the Soul; as the ancient Doctrine of the *Millenaries*, which though generally believed for almost the three first Centuries, is now a Heresy in your Church, and I think rejected by all other Churches; so many Bishops and Fathers of ancient times thought it safest, if not necessary, for little Children to receive the holy Eucharist. It was always the practice of the *African* Church. And in the time of St. *Augustin*, Pope † *Innocent* the First, as well as he, thought it necessary; and if it was that Pope's belief, no Man will doubt but it was then the belief of the Church of *Rome*, though it now stands condemned and anathematized by the Council of *Trent*, *Sess. XXI. Can. IV.* Thus Opi-

|| *Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. V. cap. XXIV.*

† St. *Aug. Ep. to the Fathers of the Milevitan Council*, which is the *XCIII. inter Epist. Augustini Tom. II. & Contra Julianum, lib. I. cap. II.*

nions and Practices, which do not affect the common Faith of Christians, I mean the Faith once delivered by the Apostles to the Saints, nor have any necessary ill influence upon good Life and Manners, nor are contrary to positive Divine Institutions, but may be safely taught in one Age or Church, and not in another, make no difference as to Religion between Bishops and Bishops, Writers and Writers, Churches and Churches.

CHAP. III

I. **T**HESE four Preliminaries being premised, to make a more regular, clear, and short Answer to your Challenge, I assert, First, That 1000 Years before our Reformation from your Church, that is to say in the middle of the sixth Century, or the Year of our Lord, 556. the whole Catholick Church, the Church of *Rome* not excepted, then professed the Religion of the reformed Church of *England*; or, which is the same thing in other terms, the reformed Church of *England* professeth, and hath the same [Faith or] Religion, which the whole Catholick Church, the Church of *Rome* not excepted, professed in the middle of the VIth Century. This I affirm, because she hath the same Canon of Scripture and the same Canon of Faith, *i. e.* the Apostles Creed [commonly so called] as confirmed and explained in the *Nicene* and *Constantinopolitan* Confessions against the Heresies of the *Arians*, *Eunomians*, or *Eudoxians*, *Semiarrians*, or opposers of the Godhead of the Son and the Holy Ghost, together with the *Sabellians*, *Marcellians*, *Photinians*, and *Apollinarians*, all Enemies of the Catholick

Catholick and Apostolick Faith. She also owns, as the whole Catholick Church then did, the Doctrine and Confessions of the first General Council of *Ephesus*, and of the General Council of *Chalcedon*, which guarded the Apostolick Canons of Faith against *Nestorius* and against *Dioscorus* and the *Eutychians*. [In a Word, she owns all the Creeds and Doctrines, and condemns all the Heresies and Hereticks, that are recited, own'd, and condemned in *lib. 1. tit. 1.* of the *Code of Justinian* the Emperor, who flourished in this Century] and hath retained the Creed, commonly called the Creed of St. *Athanasius*, as a most familiar and edifying Form of Confession, comprehending all the other Confessions, and more particularly illustrating the Mysteries of three Persons in one Nature of the Holy Trinity, and of two Natures in one Person of Christ, against the aforesaid Heresies and Enemies of the Christian Faith, though it be not of so ancient a Date as your Writers say it is. This One Catholick and Apostolick Faith professed, † explained, and defended in these Creeds and Confessions, was transmitted from the VIth to the VIIIth Century pure and entire, in the beginning of which *Augustin* the Monk propagated the Christian Faith in *England*. And therefore I assert, Secondly, that 900 Years before our separation from your Church in 656, the whole Catholick Church, and particularly the Church of *England*, then professed the Religion which we profess now, and no other. This is evident from the Confessions extant in that Century, as that of the Council of *Sevil*, A. D.

† Διὰ τὸ τοῦ γενομένης μυστικῆς τοῦ αὐτοῦ μάνηματος οἱ
 ἀποστόλοι. ἢ. ἁπλοῦς καὶ ἁπλοῦς ἀποστολικὴ ἰσχυρὰ, &c. *Cod.*
lib. 1. Tit. 1. vii.

619. That of the 4th Council of *Toledo* 633. That of the 6th Council of *Toledo* 638. That of the Council of *Lateran* 649, against all the Enemies of the Faith from *Paulus Samosatenus*, to *Sergius* Bishop of *Constantinople*. That of the Council of *Chalon* 663. That of the XIth Council of *Toledo* 675. That at *Rome* under Pope *Agatho* in the Cause of *Wilfrid* 679, or rather 680. That of the VIth Oecumenical Council of *Constantinople* 681, against the *Monothelites*, which in its first Canon declares, that no Innovation was to be made in the Apostles Creed, that the *Nicene* Creed was perfect, and the *Constantinopolitan* inviolable, and lastly that of the XIVth Council of *Toledo* 684.

II. ALL these Confessions are found together with those mentioned before in one of your own Epitomisers of the Councils, *Gregor. de Rives*, under the Title of *Confessiones Fidei Catholicae*: And the Title of the Book is, *Epitome Canonum Conciliorum*. It was Printed at *Lyons* 1663. I say, this one Catholick and Apostolick Faith set forth in the ancient Creeds, and explained and confirmed in the *Nicene* and *Constantinopolitan* Creeds, and in the Confessions of the Councils of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon*, without any addition of new Parts, was transmitted pure and entire from the VIth Century to the VIIth, and was that very primitive Catholick Faith in all its Articles, which we now profess [in the Apostles Creed] and which St. *Augustin* brought to our *Saxon* Ancestors at the latter end of the VIth Century, and propagated among them in the VIIth. That very † *Word of Life*, as *Bede* calls it. The Word of God declaring the Redemption of Mankind,

† *Bed. Eccl. Histor. gent's Angl. Edit. Cantabr.* p. 76.

by

by the Sufferings of Jesus, as the * *Saxon Homilist* expresses it. That † one Faith of all Churches, in the Words of St. *Augustin* to Pope *Gregory*. That *Christian Faith*, of which that good Pope spoke in his ** Letter to King *Ethelbert*. That †† *Fides Christi*, which King *Edwin* embraced upon the preaching of *Paulinus*, and the preaching of which is called the preaching of the Gospel by || Pope *Honorius*, in his Letter to *Honorius* Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*. That very Faith which *Theodore* and the *Saxon Clergy* explained, confirmed, and owned as delivered by the Apostles, in a Synod at *Hatfield*, A. D. DCLXXX. *Bede's Eccl. Hist. lib. 4. cap. 17.* Lastly, That † baptismal Faith, that ancient true Faith, as a *Saxon Preacher* calls it in his *Sermon* upon Baptism, was the Faith, which our *Saxon Ancestors* received, and we now profess. Their Preachers were wont to celebrate this Faith and the Memory of St. *Augustin*, who brought it to them, with all Respect, calling him the *English Apostle*, and giving him a * Day of Commemoration in their Calendars, when they used to Preach in Commendation of him. Of this Faith they had several Confessions or Creeds: One in Greek at the end of K. *Æthelstan's* Psalter in the *Cottonian Library*: Another, or it may be several others in Latin, which from the first Word of it they called the *Credo* or *Creda*, and we from them the *Creed*. So the *Homilist* in a *Saxon MS* of the *Bodleian Library*, which formerly belonged to the Church of *Worcester*, and

* *Bede Eccl. Hist. p. 77.* † *Ibid. pag. 81.* ** *Ibid. p. 101, 102.* †† *Ibid. p. 143.* || *Ibid. p. 152.* † *Ibid. p. 180.*

* *Geo. Hickesii Grammat. Anglo-Sax. & Mæso-Goth. Edit. in fol. Oxon. p. 205.*

is therefore called † *Codex Wigorniensis*. Leopen men, &c. ‘ Beloved, understand carefully, as it ‘ much concerns you, that it is your Duty to know ‘ your Religion, and learn as every Christian ought ‘ the *Pater Noster* and *Credo in Deum*; and if ‘ you cannot learn them in *Latin*, then learn them ‘ in *English* thus. After which follows a Translation of the Lord’s Prayer, and after that a paraphrastical Version of the Creed for the instruction of the People. But the Confessions most in use among them were the Apostles Creed, as it is commonly called, and which they called the *Iesse* Creed, and the *Nicene* or CP. Creed, which they called the *Messe-Creed*, because it was used at the Celebration of the *Masse* or holy Eucharist. Both which you may see in *Bede’s Ecclesiastical History*, of the *Cambridge Edition*, p. 496. The *Nicene* Creed is also to be seen in *Norman Saxon English* before the beginning of the *Liber Wigorniensis*, which was written after the Conquest, as appears from the *Decreta Normanorum Episcoporum* in it, for hitherto there were no other Creeds or Confessions of Faith in the *English Church*. In these Creeds they taught the Faith pure and entire to their *Catechumens*, without adding new Parts, as may be seen in a famous *Saxon Sermon* or Exposition, entituled, *De Fide Catholica*, in the *Bodleian Library*, N.E. F. 4. 11. The greater part of which you may read with a *Latin Translation*, in *Bede’s Ecclesiastical History*, set forth by Mr. *Wheloc*, p. 41, &c. and the rest at p. 420. and

† See my short Cabal of *Saxon MSS.* p. 141. at the end of my *Institutiones Gram. Anglo-Saxonice*. Or Mr. *Wanley’s* compleat and accurate Catal. being the second Vol. of the Work, entituled, *Antiqua Literatura Septentrionalis. Libri duo, &c.*

in p. 422. There is another excellent *Saxon Sermon*, in which you may see the Doctrine of our Ancestors, concerning Prayer, Faith, and Repentance, which is the very same we now teach. And in this, and the Sermon *De Fide Catholica*, as the *Lord's Prayer* is proposed for the *Rule of Prayer*: So the Creed is spoken of as the *Rule of Faith*. *ſclic Eyrten Man, &c. Every Christian ought rightly to understand his Pater Noster and his Creed. By his Pater Noster, he shall pray; and confirm and edifie his Faith by the Creed. I have formerly diſcourſed upon the Pater Noster, and now I proceed to explain to you the Faith that is in the Creed.* To the ſame purpoſe K. *Cnut* ſpeaks in his *Eccleſiaſtical Laws*, where he ordains, that every one ſhould learn the *Lord's Prayer*, as a *Rule of Prayer*, and the *Apoſtles Creed*, as a *Confession of the right Faith*. And long before him *Bede* in his *Epist. to Egbert*, deſired of him to charge his Clergy to teach the People the *Apoſtles Creed* and the *Lord's Prayer* in *English*; and ſaith he had tranſlated them into *English* himſelf, and given Copies of his Tranſlations to ſeveral of the Clergy. From all which it is plain, that that Diſcourſe was made to the *Catechumens* and others, who needed to be inſtructed in the *Chriſtian Faith*; and if there were any other Canon of Faith, any other Confessions or Explanations of it, than theſe above-mentioned, or any other Doctrines or Articles to be believed *firmly and conſtantly by all Men, as neceſſary to Salvation*, it is ſtrange that to that Age and much longer, they ſhould never be taught to the *English Catechumens* or People, in the Diſcourſes which their Biſhops and Priests made to them, on purpoſe to inſtruct them in the Nature of the one holy Catholick Faith.

Faith. There is another Saxon Homily, *De Fide Catholica*, not inferiour to the former, at the end of *Bede's History of Wheloc's Edition*, which also shews the Faith our Ancestors professed. And as the one primitive Faith once delivered to the Saints, was conveyed pure and entire from the Vth to the VIth, and from the VIth to the VIIth Century; so was it conveyed from the VIIth Century pure and entire. And therefore to shew you I was not afraid or unwilling to answer your Challenge, I assert in the third place, that the whole Catholick Church professed the same pure Faith and Religion which we now profess, without foreign mixture or additions, to the second Council of *Nice*, i. e. to the Year 787. and the Church of *England* professed the same pure and entire to the end of the VIIIth Century, which was but 750 Years before our separation from your Church.

III. THAT Council was the first which suffered the old Confessions of Faith to be corrupted with new Additions or Parts: For in the form of * Confession drawn up by *Basil* Bishop of *Ancyra*, after confessing God the Father, and his only begotten Son Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, Lord and Giver of Life, and the Consubstantial and Coeternal Trinity; worshipped and glorified in one Godhead and Power, and the whole Oeconomy of the one holy Trinity, and of our Lord and God Jesus Christ, as the six holy Oecumenical Councils had taught the same, and anathematizing all Heresies, that they anathematized; Then immediately follows a Confession and Acknowledgment of the Intercession of the Virgin *Mary*, and of all the heavenly Powers, and all

* Ταύτῳ ἡ ἐκκλησία με ὁμολογίαν ποιῶμαι.

the Saints, and of † honouring and worshipping their Relicks, and of embracing, saluting, and worshipping the Images of Christ and of the holy Virgin, as also of the * holy Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs, and Saints; and then after a solemn form of renouncing and anathematizing the VIIth Council at *Constantinople*, which is called a *Pseudo-Synod*, for reproaching the *holy venerable* Images, and commanding them to be taken out of the Churches, it follows: These things || I *Confess* in this manner, and assent unto them; and therefore in simplicity of Heart and Orthodoxy of Mind, as God is my Witness, I anathematize all that here follow: The Calumniators of Christians, who break down Images. Those who apply the Texts of Scripture, which are against Idolatry, against the venerable Images, &c. And then it follows. *These things I thus confess, and assent unto them; and declare with all my Heart, Soul, and Mind: And if at any time by the Temptation of the Devil, I voluntarily or involuntarily depart from what I have here professed, let me be anathematized from the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and from the Holy Catholick Church.*

This Confession and others of the like Nature, the Council commended and approved, and absolved those who made them; and in their fourth Session, † made one in the same strain and to the same purpose, too long to be here set down.

† As the Champions of Christ, who received Grace to heal the Sick, cast out Devils, &c.

* With this exception, ἵνα οὐ θεοί, &c. not as Gods, but to shew the love and affection I had for them, and to ask with all my Soul that they would intercede with God for me, and that by their Intercessions I may find Mercy in the Day of Judgment.

|| Ταῦτα ἕως ὁμολογεῖναι τοῖς συγκαταβέβαις, &c.

† Confiliorum Labb. & Cossart. Tom. vii. p. 318, 319, 320.

It is well known what Success this Council had in the *East*, by the great Zeal and powerful Endeavours of the Empress *Irene*; but in a great part of the *West*, its Decrees met not with the like Entertainment, particularly in the Kingdom of the *Franks*, under *Charles* the Great. For after the Legates of Pope *Adrian* brought the Acts of that Council into the *West*, that learned King (for as yet he was not Emperor) called a Synod of all the Bishops of *Italy*, *France*, and his other Dominions at *Franckfort* on the *Main*, in the Year 794. but seven Years after that second Council of *Nice*, with the consent of Pope *Adrian*, who sent his Legates thither. In this Council, the second Council of *Nice* and its Decrees for worshipping Images, were condemned, as our Writers have shewed you again and again out of the † *Opus Capitulare* of that Prince; and particularly Dr. *John Forbes* in the XIth Chapter of the VIIth Book of his learned Work entituled, *Instructiones Historico-Theologicae*, printed at *Amsterdam* MDCXLV.

It was also condemned and anathematized by a Council at *Constantinople*, under the Emperor *Leo Armenius*, which called it a *Pseudo-Synod*, and damned the Adoration of Images in the IXth Century, viz. in the Year 814. It was condemn-

† See a Book in 8vo Entituled, *Opus illustrissimi & excellentissimi, seu spectabilis viri Caroli Magni nutu Dei Regis Francorum, contra Synodum, qua in partibus Græciæ pro adorandis imaginibus, stolidè, seu arroganter gesta est.*

Item Pauli Aquiliensis adversus Felicem Urgelitanum, & Eliphandum Toletanum Episcopos Libellus. Anno salutis MDXLIX.

This Book and the *Synodus Parisiensis* cited in the next Page have a Preface written before them with this Title: *Caroli M. Imp. & Synodi Parisiensis sub Ludovico Pio Caroli M. F. scripta de Imaginibus edita ad fidem vetust. exemplarium Johan. Tilii Episcopi Meldensis & P. Pithæi Jurisconsulti Parisiensis.*

ed

ed again in the Year 825 by a † Synod at *Paris*, in the time of *Ludovicus Pius* Emperor of the *West*, and *Michael Balbus* Emperor of the *East*, who sent some Divines about that Controversy to *Ludovicus*; and not only this second Synod of *Nice*, and its Doctrines of worshipping Images, were rejected by them, but two Epistles of Pope *Adrian* the First were condemned by them, as Erroneous, *viz.* the Epistle which he wrote to *Constantinus* and *Irene* for the Adoration of Images, and that which he wrote in defence of the second *Nicene* Council to *Charles* the Great. And how the Church of *England* agreed then with the *German* and *Gallican* Churches against the Adoration of Images, may be seen from our own Historians, as Arch-Bishop *Usher* hath observed, whose Words I shall * here transcribe: — ‘Synodus illa λησρονή, quæ septimæ Nomen usurpavit pro imaginum Cultu stabiliendo *Niceæ* Coacta, de quâ quid Ecclesiæ Britannicæ senserint, Anglorum Historici *Simon Dunelmensis*, *Rogerus Hovedenus*, *Matheus Florilegus*, & *Roffensis* Historiæ Author hunc in modum referunt. In anno ab Incarnatione Dom. 792. Carolus Rex Francorum misit Synodalem librum ad Britanniam (sibi à Constantinopoli directum) in quo (libro pro dolor!) multa inconvenientia & veræ fidei Contraria reperta sunt: Meamè quoddam pene omnium Orientalium Doctorem (non minùs quàm trecentorum, vel eo ampliùs Episcoporum) unanimè

† Apud Melchiorum Goldastum in Collect. Constit. Imperialium. Tom. 1. And in a Book entituled, Synodus Parisiensis de Imaginibus habita Anno. Chr. DCCCXXIV. de vetustissimo codice descripta, Francofurti, MDXCVI. in 8vo.

* De Christianæ Ecclesiarum Successione & Statu. Cap. 11. 4. See also Hen. Spelman. Concilia. Vol. 1. in Anno 792. p. 395, &c.

assertione Confirmatum est Imagines adorari debere : quod omnino Ecclesia Dei execratur. Contra quod scripsit Alcuinus, & Epistolam ex auctoritate divinarum Scripturarum mirabiliter affirmatam, illamque cum eodem libro ex persona Episcoporum, & Principum nostrorum Regi Francia attulit.

From which Words, Sir, it is plain, First, That the Judgment of the English Church or Churches at that time was against the Adoration of Images, which they counted Execrable, Secondly, That Alcuin our Countryman wrote an Epistle, in which he proved from the Holy Scriptures, that it was unlawful. Thirdly, That the Kings and Bishops of England approved that Epistle, and authorized him to offer it in their Names to Charles the Great, King of the Franks, who called the Council of Franckfort, and entertained Alcuin to assist him in that Council. Sir, I have shewed you all this to prove my Assertion above, that the Church of England kept the ancient Faith pure and entire, without [foreign] additions or additional Confessions to the end of the VIIIth Century, and particularly from the additional Confession of the second Council of Nice, especially as to the Adoration of Images; and by consequence that the Faith and the Religion of the Church of England now is the same it was then, or that the Bishops, Kings, and Writers (particularly Alcuin, who was Bede's Scholar) and Churches of England then professed our Religion; and I Challenge you to shew, that they then professed yours, that is, the Papal part of your Religion, from which we have reformed.

IV. You must give me leave also to observe from the Authorities cited above out of Archbishop Usher, that the English Church rejected *

* In quo libro (proh dolor!) multa inconvenientia & vera Fidei contraria reperta sunt

the other new Doctrines of the second Council of Nice, as the Intercession and Invocation of Saints, particularly of the blessed Virgin, and adoring their Relicks ; and accordingly the reading of the XLIIId. Canon of the Council of *Frankfort*, in the † MS of *Claudius Puteanus's* Library is not as in *Labbe's* and *Cossartius's* Edition, *ut nulli novi Sancticolantur, aut invocentur*, &c. but *ut nulli nobis Sancti colantur, aut invocentur* ; after which it follows, *nec memoria eorum per vias erigantur. Sed hi soli sunt venerandi* (not *colendi* aut *invocandi*) *aut memoria eorum per vias erigenda, qui electi sunt ex auctoritate passionum, & vite merito.* The Canon thus read plainly distinguishes *Veneratio* from *Cultus* and *Invocatio* ; and accordingly the Title of the Canon, which is the XLIIId. in the *Putean MS.* is *Quinam Sancti in Ecclesia venerandi sunt.* For there is a Veneration due to Martyrs and pious Confessors, which consists in commemorating their Courage, Constancy, and Sufferings ; in always speaking with respect and reverence of them ; in declaring to the World their noble acts of Patience, Charity, and Humility, and Love and Beneficence to their Enemies ; and in erecting publick Statues and Monuments, as of other Heroes, in remembrance of them. In this chaste Sense you know, Sir, *Cicero* saith, *habet venerationem justam quicquid excellit*, and that this is a common *Latin Phrase*, *memoriam alicujus venerari.* This is all the Veneration to this time and some time longer, that our Ancestors of the *English Church* shew'd to Saints, without any *Cult*, or *Invocation*, or *Adoration* of their Images. For in all their rude Pictures we find in their MSS that re-

† *Vita, & Opera Aicunt* ex edit. *Andreae Quercetani Parisiis*, 1617. p. 1890.

main among us, there are none that I ever observed, made for Adoration, except one of our Lord with St. *Dunstan* prostrate at his Feet, which I have printed in my *Saxon Grammar*, p. 145 ; and which the hand of the Inscription proves to have been made about the time of the Conquest. Had they embraced the Adoration of Images, they would in probability have had better Pictures. But they us'd at least to the Xth Century to speak chaffly of their Saints. Accordingly, in a *Harmony of the four Gospels*, or rather a *History of Jesus Christ made out of them all*, written about the time of *Charles* the Great in the *Francick* Tongue, and extant in the *Cottonian Library*, Caligula A. VII. I. There are no Appellations or Titles given to the Virgin *Mary*, but what any Protestant will allow may be given her, especially in a *Poetical Writing*, as that Book is. And in a *Poetical Calendar* written in the *Dano-Saxonick* Tongue, which I have published in the XXIII^d. Chapter of my *Anglo-Saxonick Grammar*, she is plainly called *Mary* ; from whence I think it not unreasonable to infer, that in the Ages in which those Books were written, the Invocation of Saints and Adoration of their Images were either in none, or very little use among the *Franks* or *English-Saxons*, and by consequence not yet established by Ecclesiastical or Regal Authority among either of them. But, Sir, to conclude my Answer to your Challenge, I assert that we have the same Faith and Religion, that *Pope Gregory* the Great sent to our Ancestors without Addition or Alteration ; for what he professed was his Faith, we profess now. I shall faithfully translate his Confession, as I find it in *Garnerius's Notes* upon the 11th Chapter of *Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*, published by him at *Paris*, M. DC. LXX.

Ibe-

I believe in One Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Three Persons, One Substance: The Father unbegotten, the Son begotten, the Holy Ghost neither begotten, nor unbegotten, but Coeternal, proceeding from the Father and the Son. I confess the only begotten Consubstantial Son, born of his Father before all Time, Creator of all Things, visible and invisible, Light of Light, very God of very God, the Brightness of his Glory, the Character of his Substance, who being the Word before all Worlds, was created perfect Man towards the end of the World, conceived, and born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary; he took our Nature without Sin, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and was buried, and rose the third Day from the dead, and ascended the fortieth Day into Heaven, and sits at the right Hand of the Father, from whence he will come to judge the quick and the dead, and will lay open the secret of every Man before all Men, and will give the everlasting Rewards of the Kingdom of Heaven to the Righteous, but to the Unrighteous the Punishments of eternal Fire, and renew the World by Fire, and the Resurrection of the Body. I confess one Faith, one Baptism, one Apostolical and Universal Church, in which only there is remission of Sins, in the Name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Of this Confession before his Consecration, Johannes Diaconus saith thus. This Man of Consummate Humanity and Orthodox Authority, standing on the Watch-Tower of the Holy Universal Church, from whence he might be clearly seen and heard as a Preacher of the Gospel, confirmed the right Faith, and confounded all Heresies with one Creed in these Words, Credo in Unum Deum, &c.

AFTER his Consecration, he sent a Synodical Confession of Faith, according to ancient Custom, to

the other † Patriarchs (for he abhorred the Title of Universal Bishop) in these Words: *Because with the Heart Man believeth unto Righteousness, and with the Mouth Confession is made unto Salvation,* as I confess to receive and reverence the four Books of the Holy Gospel; so I confess, I receive and reverence four Councils, viz. the Nicene in which was confounded the wicked Doctrine of Arius; the Constantinopolitan, in which was convicted the Error of Eunomius and Macedonius; the Ephesian, in which was condemned the impious Doctrine of Nestorius; and that of Chalcedon, in which the naughty Doctrine of Eutyches and Dioscorus was rejected, I embrace with all Devotion, and observe with entire Approbation, because on these Councils the Structure of the Holy Faith is erected, as on a four-square Stone, and the right Rule of every Christian's Life and Action consists in them. In like manner, I also reverence the fifth Council, in which the Epistle, which is called the Epistle of Ibas, being full of Error is rejected, and Theodorus, who taught that there were two Persons in the Mediator between God and Man in the two Natures is convicted to have lapsed into perfidious Impiety. Also the Writings of Theodore, in which the Faith of St. Cyril is reprobated. Furthermore, I reject all Persons whom those venerable Councils reject, and those whom they reverence I embrace; because they being established by Universal Consent, he destroys himself and not them, whosoever presumes*

† Lib. diutn. Appendix ad Notas Cap. II. p. 159. Synodicam quoque suam Gregorius, secundum priscum decessorum suorum morem Johanni Constantinopolitano, Eulogio Alexandrino, Gregorio Antiocheno, Joanni Hierosolymitano, & Anastasio Patriarche Antiocheno destinavit.

* This Confession of Gregory the Great is in the Decretum of Gratian. I. d. 15. c. 11.

either

either to loose whom they bind, or bind whom they loose. And whosoever thinks otherways, let him be Anathema.

This Vth General Council determined all things out of the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers. They owned the *Nicene* and *Constantinopolitan* Creeds. They received the four first General Councils, and all their definitions *pro unâ eâdemque Fide*, in defence of one and the same Faith. That one and the same Faith, which *Gregory* sent into *England* by *Augustin* the Monk, between 900 or 1000 Years ago, we professed at the Reformation, and still profess it. And therefore in naming *Gregory* the Great, who was both a Bishop and a Writer, and the Patriarchs of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and *Hierusalem*, to whom he sent his Synodical Confession, I think I have named Bishops, Writers, and Churches enough, who professed our Religion 900 or 1000 Years before our Separation from your Church. Nay, Sir, we own and profess every thing in that excellent form of Confession before Consecration, intituled, *secunda professio Fidei*, in the IX. Tit. of *Liber Diurnus*, which was made between the Years 683 and 715, * and in which Pope *Honorius* is number'd

* *Auctores verò novi Hæretici dogmatis Sergium, Pyrrhum, Paulum, & Petrum, Constantinopolitanos, und cum Honorio, qui pravis eorum assertionibus fomentum impendit——qui hæretica dogmata contra veritatem fidei Synodaliter decreverunt. Honorius was anathematized as an Heretick by the sixth General Council. Θεοδώρου αλεξια, &c. Anathema to Theodorus Pharanita the Heretick; Anathema to Sergius the Heretick; Anathema to Honorius the Heretick; Anathema to Cyrus the Heretick; Anathema to Pyrrhus the Heretick; Anathema to all favourers of Hereticks. He is anathematized again in the Oration they made to the Emperor, and by Pope Leo in his Epistle to the Emperors, which is at the end of the Acts of that Synod.*

ber'd among the Hereticks; and to use the Words of it, *Cognoscat vestra dilectio, &c.* Let your Reverence know and be assured, that we preach, and bold, and defend with entire satisfaction the Faith of Christ, which the Apostles delivered, the Disciples of the Apostles taught, and their Apostolical Successors, our approved Predecessors, immutably kept and defended. To which let me add these Words: *Unde & districti anathematis interdictioni subjecimus, &c.* If any Person, whether I or any other, presume to alter this Evangelical Tradition (of the first six General Councils) or the entireness of the right Faith and Christian Religion by attempting any new thing, or any thing contrary thereunto, or to substract from the entireness of our Faith, or to consent to those, who with sacrilegious boldness presume to do so; we subject him to the sentence of an Anathema, i. e. to be separated from the Communion of the Catholick Church.

We likewise own and profess what is contained there, in the third profession of Faith to be made after Consecration, of the same Age with the former: *Orthodoxa atque Apostolica fidei Normam tenentes*, holding the rule of right Apostolical Faith, *& nunquam aliquid novi contra Catholicam atque Orthodoxam Fidem suscepturi*, and resolving never to receive any new Additions against the true Catholick Faith. * To these Confessions we appeal in the Controversy between you and us, and let

Synod. And how can the Pope of Rome, saith *Neilus* Archbishop of *Theffalonica*, like a Tyrant, pretend to be unaccountable; when in the case of Doctrine, *Honorius* is an example to the contrary who by the judgment of the sixth General Council, was delivered up to an *Anathema*? From which at the time of Death he had not Absolution. See *Du Pin de Antiquâ Ecclesia disciplinâ Dissert. V. §. iii.*

* See the three Confessions of Faith in the Ordination of a Bishop in *Morinus De Sacris ordinibus*, p. 119 &c.

it

it be tryed by them, whether your Religion or ours is an *Innovation* ; and whether ours was not professed by the Church of God and its Bishops, Writers, and Congregations 900 or 1000 Years before our Separation from your Church, when I challenge you again to shew any Bishops, Writers, or Churches, that professed yours.

C H A P. IV.

I. **H**AVING now answered your Challenge, I proceed to answer the rest of your Reply, which is like all that I have already answered, verbose, ambiguous, and cavilling. The ground of your Query, as you call your Supposition, was penned in these Words: *Supposing this for true, that the Church of Christ can never perish* ; where I desired to know what you meant by *perish* ? For *perish*, I said, might either signify that the Church may be quite destroyed, so as to have no being in the World, as it had not before it began to be ; or secondly, that it may signifie only not to be the same Church, as to Doctrine, Worship, or Polity, which was founded by Christ, and finished by the Apostles, but to be corrupted (*I now desire to add, miserably corrupted*) in one or all those parts of its Constitution ; so that it ceases to be a sound, right constituted, or Apostolical Church, being so depraved in one, or more, or all the parts of its Constitution, that a Catholick or truly faithful Christian cannot communicate in it without Sin. To *perish* in the former Signification I told you, was for the Church to perish in a *metaphysical sense* ; but to *perish* in the latter, was to perish in a *moral sense* ; and this distinction, which is plain and obvious to any common

common understanding, you do not disallow, but only endeavour to shew it is impertinent. I am forced to follow you in the Chace you lead me, and therefore to my great loss of time must transcribe the Words in which you reply, that I may make distinct answers to them. *I appeal* (say you in your second Paragraph) *to any Divine, whether the Words of the Proposition (supposing this for true that the Church of Christ can never perish) be not clear*; and I appeal, Sir, to any Divine, whether your Hypothetical Proposition would not have been more clear in these Words: *Supposing this for true that the Church of Christ can quite perish, so as to cease to be a Church*; or in these, *Supposing this for true that the Church of Christ may be quite destroyed, so as to have no being*. If it would have had a more clear and determined sense in these or the like Words, then it was not clear in yours; because they did not determine the sense in which *perish* was to be taken, that is to say, in the metaphysical, or in the moral sense. Then you proceed, *He desires to know what the Word perish means*. I answer, *to perish is to cease to be, to lose the Essence the thing had before it perished*. I think, Sir, you should have said to lose the *Existence* it had before it perished. But to let that pass, I answer in the other sense of the Word, *to perish also in common usage of speech, signifies to cease to be in the same good State and Condition, that a thing was in before*; or to lose those good Qualities and Perfections, natural or moral, according to the Nature of the thing, in which its excellency or goodness did consist. A Man (say you) *perishes, when he dyes, because he ceases to be a Man*; and a Man (I say) also *perishes when he becomes extremely vicious, because he abandons humane Nature, and ceases to be a virtuous Man*. Thus in our own Language we

speak

speak properly, when we say *Vice destroys a Man,*
before he dyes, or a Man is undone by Vice before
 his Death. So the French say of a dissolute profligate
 Man, *C'est un Homme perdu,* as the Latins call
 such an one *Homo perditus,* It is Cicero's own
 phrase for a wicked Fellow. So he saith of a
 young Man that was past all hopes of being reclaim-
 ed, that he was *perditus & dissolutus Adolescens;*
 and of a pack of desperate Rogues, *Nihil est perditius*
his hominibus. So St. Cyprian Epist. 99, calls
 the Abettors and Accomplices of the false usurping
 Bishop *Fortunatus homines desperatos & perditos*
 which Lombart renders *des hommes perdus & des-*
esperez, desperate and undone Men, or lost Men of
 whom there was no hope. So in the Greek speaks
 Demosthenes ἀπὸ τούτων τῆς κακίας ἀπολεσμέναν ἀνθρώ-
 πων, *ab istis perditissimis hominibus.* So Aristophanes
 in *Pluto:* Σὺ δ' ὦ κακίς ἀπολεσμένη τί λαισώρεῖς,
O perditissima quid Tu convitiaris. Thus Luk. xv.
 24, 32. The Words of Death and Destruction are
 applied to the Prodigal, tho' he was alive, νεκρὸς
 ὡς καὶ ἀνέζησεν, καὶ ἀπολωλὼς ὡς &c. *Filius hic meus*
mortuus erat & revixit, perierat & inventus est.
 And so τὸ ἀπολωλὸς is expounded Matth. xviii.
 11. Luke xix. 10. Venit Filius hominis quærere, &
 saluum facere quod perierat: *The Son of Man came*
to seek and save that which was lost. And so it
 signifies in other places, as Matth. x. 6. John xviii.
 12. 2 Cor. iv. 3. Perish is a *Nutropassive Verb* in
 our Language, as *pereo* in Latin, and they signifie
 as *perder* in that Language, and ἔλλυμι or ἀπόλλυμι
 in the Greek: And I believe there is no Language,
 wherein the *Words of Destruction* are not familiarly
 used of Things and Persons, when they are altered
 for the worse, beyond hopes of amendment; or
 when those Virtues and Qualities perish, wherein
 their (natural or moral) excellency did consist, tho'
 they

they retain their Being. Thus we also say of a Man, who hath lost the use of his Reason and Memory, that he is dead, or hath out-lived himself. *Moses* counted *Miriam* as dead, when she was struck with the Leprosy, *Numbers* xii. 12. And thus in our Language we say of strong Liquors, that they are dead or perished, when their strength only perishes; and of Flowers, that they are *perished*, when their Odour and Beauty only is gone. Then it follows in your Words: *This is the evident, common, and obvious meaning of the Word*; and the other, as I have shew'd, is as evident, common, and obvious, as that. Then immediately it follows again, *But*, says he, *the Word perish may be taken in a moral sense, to mean, for example, that the Church perishes, when it ceases to be a sound, well constituted Church.* It is true, I said it, and now stand to it, that the Church may be said to perish, in a *moral sense*, when it ceases to be a sound Church in one or more parts of its Constitution, to such a degree of depravation and corruption, that a faithful Christian cannot communicate in it without Sin, tho' it retains its Being, and continues to be a real Church. Sir, I use the Word *real* rather than *true*, to take away the ambiguity of the phrase, *true Church*; and I pray you to observe it, because it will save me some labour hereafter in distinguishing the metaphysical, from the moral signification of *true*, which when joyned with *Church* may signify a *real* or a *right* Church. Then it follows; *Suppose this were true, it is nothing to his purpose, for Words are always to be taken in their proper signification, unless there be some good reason to the contrary.* Whether it was to my purpose or no, to say that *perish* may be taken in a moral sense, for the Church's ceasing to be a sound Church, to such a degree that a faithful Christian cannot

cannot communicate in it without Sin, shall be seen in the process of my Answer. And whether there was not a good reason to say that *perish* might be taken in this, which I acknowledge is not the *proper*, if by proper you mean the literal, but the *figurative* or *tropical sense*; I appeal to what I have already said, as to the common and obvious sense of the Word in all Languages, wherein Things and Persons depraved and corrupted in a mighty degree (*tho' they retain their being*) are properly said to be perished and destroyed, as *property* signifies *aptly* and in common use of Speech. Nay, this tropical sense of the Word *perish*, is of the two the more common in Speech; and this I assign for a good reason, why I desired to know what you meant by *perish*, when you supposed it for true, that the Church of Christ cannot perish. Secondly, *you say it is absolutely false that the Church may be said to perish, whilst it retains every thing essential to the Constitution of a true Church.* Here, Sir, I joyn with you, if by a true Church, you mean a *right Church*. For a right Church, is a sound Church. But a sound Church indeed, while it remains such, cannot be said to perish in either sense; because it retains not only its Being, but its purity and soundness, whereof the latter makes it to be a right, as the former to be a real Church. But if by a *true Church*, you mean a *real Church*, then I must say your *assertion is absolutely false*, because as a Man retains his being, tho' he be ruined in his Intellectuals or Morals, and thereby undone in a tropical sense; so a Church depraved and corrupted to that miserable degree which I have mentioned, may be said to perish in a moral, which is a tropical sense, tho' it retains its being, and remains a *real Church*. Thus the *Jewish Church*, which was the Church of Christ under the Law, when it was corrupted to
that

that degree, that God, as it were, looked upon it *as no Church*; yet retained its Being and Relation to him, and remained his Church still, as you will give me Opportunity to shew. But then in your sophistical way you offer some semblance of Reason, why a Church *cannot be said to perish, whilst it retains the Essentials of a true Church, tho' it is unsound in some part of it, because a Man cannot be said to perish, when he loses a Finger, or falls sick.* Pray, Sir, is there no difference between an *integral* and an *essential* part? The Church of which I affirm, that it may be truly said to perish, is a Church, which is so miserably depraved and vitiated in Doctrine, Worship, or Polity, which are the essential parts of its Constitution, that a true Catholick cannot lawfully communicate with it, by reason of those Corruptions; and such a Church may in common usage of Speech be said to perish in a tropical Sense, tho' it retains those Essentials, because it retains them so corrupted and depraved. In like manner, as a Man who hath lost the health of his Body, and the soundness of his Mind, is (in common usage of Speech aptly) said to be *lost, gone, undone, ruin'd*, nay not to be himself, tho' in that miserable State he retains the Essentials of his Constitution, because he retains them so corrupted and depraved. And then as to your Similitude of *falling sick*, I must tell you that there is a great difference in Patients, and great diversity in the kinds and degrees of Sickness. Some Patients are willing to be cured, and some are so obstinate and opiniatre, that they will not admit any means of Cure. Some are affected in a few, and those the less noble, and some in all the most noble and vital Parts. Some labour under long, dangerous, grievous, and pestilential Diseases; and some of Distempers, which soon go off, and in which there is

no

no danger to the sick Person, nor to others by Infection from him. Now to set my Similitude against yours ; I believe, Sir, speaking in any Language of such a sick Person as had a long, most dangerous, noysome, and infectious Distemper in all his most noble and vital Parts, and withal was not sensible of his Disease or the great Danger of it, nor could be perswaded to submit to a Cure : I say, Sir, speaking of such a Person, I believe you would make no difficulty to say he was in a desperate *perishing* Condition ; that he was a *lost, dead, undone* Man. Sir, there is, and hath been for a long time, a very morbid Church in the World, of which such a sick Person is not an unfit Emblem. Like the Church of *Judah and Jerusalem*, *Isaiah* 1. 6. There is no sound Part in her, either Integral or Essential. From the Head to the Sole of the Foot, from the Metropolis to the meanest Parish, in Doctrine, Worship, and Government, she is full of Corruption and putrid Sores. The Writers of her own Communion have complain'd grievously of her, and called her by Names I will not mention ; and though she doth not cease to be a Church, and so is not perished in the *literal* Sense, yet because for many Ages she hath ceased to be a sound and right Church, she hath *perished* from what she was, and destroyed her self in the *tropical* Sense, which is a very common and usual Sense of the Word.

II. THEN you go on in these Words ; *when he will allow that every Man perishes, that falls into a Puddle and dirties himself, then I will allow this Exception of his to be pertinent.* By this Exception, I suppose you mean my Distinction of perishing in a metaphysical and in a moral Sense, the former of which is the literal, and the latter the figurative, but not the less apt or proper use

G

of

of the Word. But now, Sir, I have not said any thing to imply, that a clean Man perishes in any sense, when he grows dirty; you may make me speak impertinently and absurdly when you please by misrepresenting what I say: And so you have done by one Expression in my Answer to your Challenge, *Name your Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay, one single Congregation of Protestants for 900 or 1000 Years before your Separation, &c.* I told you this was an absurd and unreasonable Demand, because you asked us to shew reformed Protestant Bishops, Writers, and Churches, before there were any Protestants, that is before the Reformation; and that you might as well have bid us name our Protestant Kings and Courts before *Edward the VIth*, or ask a Sloven where his clean Face was so many Days before it was washed. But you are so ingenuous, as to extend my Similitude not only beyond, but to a purpose contrary to that, for which I brought it. Then it follows in Words to the same Effect, and as little to the Purpose: *In the mean time let him reflect, that in case the Church had been unsound, that dath not amount to perishing, but only to being depraved; nor in such Case had she lost her self (which is to perish) but only her Beauty, or her sound Constitution.* But, Sir, when a Church becomes so unsound, corrupt, and depraved in any or all the essential parts of its Constitution, that it ceases to be a right constituted Church, and that a truly Catholick Christian cannot communicate in her without Sin; when she is unsound to such an intolerable degree, then she loses her self with the soundness of her Constitution, and like other things in the like ill Condition, is reputed as lost, and properly, *i. e.* aptly said to *perish* in such a state of Corruption, as drives the Faithful from her Communion, tho' she retains her Being, *i. e.* tho'

tho' she still remains a depraved and corrupt Church.

III. THEN you proceed, saying, *Besides, what imaginable reason had he to think, that I should take the word perish for being unfound, suppose it could be taken so?* That the word *perish* may, nay, is so taken and used to signify depravation or un-soundness in such a degree, as I have described it, is proved by many Instances in several Languages; and that a Church may be said to *perish* that is so corrupt, as to cease to be Catholick and of no farther use to the Faithful, I still assert; and the Nature of the Controversy which I saw wrapt up in that Word, obliged me to take notice of the *tropical*, but very (apt and) common sense of it; especially to an Adversary, who would not have it so taken, because it is his Interest to make Men believe, that the *Roman Church*, which he always understands by the *Church of Christ*, cannot *perish* in that sense, *i. e.* That it cannot lose its Purity and Soundness, and retain its Being, or cease to be a pure, sound, or truly Catholick Church, tho' it doth not cease to be a Church. The Controversial Writers among you do not love this Distinction; and you so feel the Inconveniences of it, that supposing your Church exclusively of all others to be the *Church of Christ*, you still labour in vain to confound that Distinction, by making the two senses of *perish* but one; and thereby absurdly endeavour to prove, against the Nature of a Church, the History of Churches, and common sense, that if your Church was so corrupt as we pretend, when we reform'd from it, it was not a Church.

C H A P. V.

THEN in your third Paragraph you call my other Distinction of the larger from the narrower sense, in which the *Church of Christ* is taken, a *cavil and dissingenuous trifling* for the same reason, because you do not love it; and you do not love it, because you saw it was made to shew, that the Church of Rome was but a *part of the Church of Christ*, and not the *whole* or universal Church. His *second Cavil* (say you) is upon these Words, the Church of Christ. For (says he) it may be taken in two senses; one as large as Christianity (and you should have added my other Words) for the whole Universal Church, wheresoever dispersed over the Earth, or for some part of it greater or less (I added) comprehending one or more Churches, but not the Universal Church. Sir, I must take the liberty to tell you, that you must be a Man of very great Assurance, to say that this Distinction, which is so common in Ecclesiastical Writers in all Languages, is a cavil, and trifling, and false. For to begin with the Holy Scriptures, it is used in both senses therein. First, for the Universal Church or whole Body of Christ's Church, as *Eph. i. 22, 23.* and gave him (i. e. Christ) over all things to the Church, which is his Body, the fulness of him, that filleth all in all. The vulgar Latin or Version of your Church hath it, *ipsum dedit Caput super omnem Ecclesiam*, and gave him to be the Head over all the Church, which is as large as Christianity; and † *St. Ignatius*, who first

† *Epist. ad Smyrneses.*

used the phrase of *Καθολικὴ Ἐκκλησία*, or *Universal Church*, useth it in the same sense, for the whole Christian Church dispersed over the whole World, of which Christ is the only Head: *ὅπου ἀνὴρ ὁ Ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἴσω. ὡσαύτως ὅπου ἂν ᾖ ὁ Χριστὸς ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.* *Utique ubi apparet Episcopus illic Multitudo* (Congregatio) *sit, quemadmodum ubi est Christus Jesus, illic Catholica Ecclesia.* The sense of which place is this: That the People in every Church are to adhere to the Bishop, who is their visible ministerial Head, as the Universal Church doth adhere to her invisible Head and Archetypal High Priest, Jesus Christ. But to return to the New Testament, the Church is taken for the Universal Church, *Eph. v. 23, 24, 25, 26. The Husband is the Head of the Wife, even as Christ is the Head of the Church. Therefore as the Church is subject unto Christ, &c. Husbands love your Wives, as Christ loveth the Church and gave himself for it.* To which I might add, *Acts ii. 47. Coloss. i. 18, 24. Matth. xvi. 18. 1 Cor. xii. 28.* Secondly, It is as familiarly used for some part of the Universal Church, greater or less, as in the following places: *This is he who was in the Church, in the Wilderness. There was a great Persecution of the Church, which was at Hierusalem. Tidings of these things came unto the Ears of the Church, which was at Hierusalem. Herod stretched forth his Hands to vex certain of the Church. Prayer was made without ceasing of the Church unto God for him. Now there was in the Church that was at Antioch———. From Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the Elders of the Church. Take heed to your selves and to all the Flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops to feed the Church of God* (in Ephesus and

and the Regions thereof) which he hath purchased with his Blood. Unto the Church of God, which is at Corinth. Cause this Epistle to be read in the Church of the Laodiceans. Unto the Church of the Thessalonians. So to Timothy at Ephesus, Let not the Church be charged. If any Man is sick among you, let him call for the Elders of the Church. Unto the Angel of the Church of Ephesus. A Servant of the Church, who is at Cenchrea. Greet the Church, that is in their House. Aquila and Priscilla salute you with the Church, that is in their House. Thus, Sir, you see the Church and the Church of God is used both explicitly and implicitly, to signify the particular Churches of Nations, Provinces, and Countries adjacent; nay, of Towns, Villages, and Families, which are the least parts of the Universal Church. It is implicitly used to signify the Church of Ancyra, by Apollinarius Bishop of Hierapolis, in Eusebius's History, Lib. V. cap. XVI. *Ὁς ἦ μὲν ἐκκλησίαν, &c.* So that the Church (understanding the Church of Ancyra) exceedingly rejoiced, and was mightily comforted in the Faith. [So the true Church of Rome under Cornelius, as distinguished from the schismatical Church there under Novatianus, is implicitly called the Church of Christ by St. Cyprian in his Epistle to Pope Lucius upon his return from Banishment: Unde contra Ecclesiam Christi, & Episcopum Cornelium beatum martyrem, vobis omnes, secularis potestas subito proruperit, ut ad confundendos Hæreticos, & retundendos ostenderet Dominus, quæ esset Ecclesia, quis Episcopus ejus unus divina ordinatione electus; whence the secular Power broke out in a sudden Persecution against the Church of Christ, and its Bishop and blessed Martyr Cornelius, and against you

you all, that our Lord might shew to the confusion and mortification of the Hereticks, which was his Church, and who was his own Bishop elected by the Appointed of God. I could bring you more Examples out of St. Cyprian, in which the Church, the Church of Christ, the Catholick Church, are taken implicitly to signify particular Churches; but I reserve them for another Place.] And as for the explicit use of them for particular Churches, nothing is more common, as in St. Clement's Epistle, who was Bishop of Rome, to the Church of Corinth : Ἡ ἐκκλησία * Θεῷ ἡ παρρησία Ρώμῃ καὶ ἐκκλησία * Θεῷ παρρησία Κόρινθον The Church of God which is at Rome, to the Church of God which is at Corinth. So the * Church of Smyrna, in their Epistle concerning the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp their Bishop, to the Church of Philomelium : Ἡ ἐκκλησία * Θεῷ ἡ παρρησία Σμύρναν, &c. The Church of God which is at Smyrna, to that at Philomelium, and to all the Districts or People of the Catholick Church, Grace, Peace, and the Love of God the Father, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, be multiplied. So † in St. Athanasius's Works, Tom. 1. p. 779. Κωνσταντίνῳ μετρίῳ σέβας καὶ λαῷ τοῦ καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρειαν καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. Constantine the great Emperor, to the People of the Catholick Church of Alexandria. So in the same Epistle, p. 794. Κατα' τὴν καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τὴν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, against the Catholick Church in Egypt. I hope, Sir, you'll allow the Church of God and the Catholick Church to signify the Church of Christ; and then I hope these Examples, without here producing others which are mentioned in their proper place, make it evident that the Church of Christ, with-

* Euseb. Eccl. Hist. Lib. IV. Cap. XV.

† Edit. Paris. MDCXXVII.

out any Cavil or Trifling, may be taken either *absolutely* or in *opposition*, [either explicitly or implicitly] for a part of the Universal Church, comprehending one, or more Churches, as well as for the whole or Universal Church, of which he only is the Head.

II. I HAVE made use of this old and true Distinction, [which is justified by the Learned † Patriarch so often cited by me,] on purpose to force you to discover the Fallacy, which you couched in your Supposition; for I knew very well, that by the *Church of Christ* you meant *your own Church*; and that it would put a difficulty upon you how to express your meaning, because if you should say in plain Words you meant the *Roman Catholick Church*, then you knew I would reply, that the Roman Catholick Church, so called, was not the whole Universal Church to which the Promise of Indefeasibility was made, but a part of it, which might perish, as many other National, Provincial, and Diocesan Churches had done, without any failure of the Church of God. But if you should say, you meant the *holy Catholick Church*, or *the holy Catholick and Apostolick Church*, then you knew I should tell you, that

† *Nesarius* in his Answer to DOM. PETER against the Pope's Supremacy, p. 214. *Et hac propriè dicitur Catholica, & simpliciter Ecclesia Dei.* — *Dicitur & Ecclesia Synecdochicè; quòd in parte ad totam refertur Ecclesiam, qualia sunt plurima à te prolata, sicut fatetur Apostolus ad Corinthios Scribens, quia persecutus sum Ecclesiam Dei, Maxime enim Hierosolymis, & Damasco etiam tantam insurrexerat contra illas duas Ecclesias, sed intentione contra omnem Catholicam.* — *Tale est quod in 1 ad Tim. cap. 3. ostenditur. Scribo ad te, O Timothee, ut cognoscas quomodo oportet conversari in Ecclesiâ Dei, quæ est Ecclesia Dei viventis, columna & firmamentum veritatis. Tunc autem conversabatur Timotheus in Ecclesiâ Ephesi, sed ipsius sancta conversatio, omnem edificabat Ecclesiam.*

the

the Roman Church, when in its purest state, was but a Part or Member of the one holy Catholick and Apostolick Church; and that now with all the Churches which are in Communion with it, is but one great and most corrupt Part of the Church of God, as the Church is sometimes taken (*latissime*) in the most large sense of all, for all the Churches, sound or unsound, orthodox or heretical, pure or corrupt, professing the Christian Religion throughout the whole World. This you were aware of; and therefore not liking my Distinction, to either Part of which you could not, you durst not answer plainly and fairly, you grew very angry at it, and gave it the hard Names above-mentioned, though as I have shewed, it is as old as the Christian Religion. But let us go to your Words: *I might pay him in his own Coin, and ask him what he means by Christianity, whether those Faithful only that are baptized, as we mean it; or those that believe in Christ, whether baptized or no.* If you had pleased, Sir, you might have asked me, whether I meant the Church *Militant* or *Triumphant*, and it had been as much to the purpose. For if by Believers not baptized, you mean the truly faithful *Catechumens*, who are Candidates of Baptism, they shall be Parts or not Parts, Members or not Members of the Universal Church of God, by which I explained my sense of Christianity, as you will. But if by Believers not baptized, you mean those pretended Believers who reject Baptism, you know they are no part of the Universal Church of Christ or truly Catholick Christianity, in my most proper sense of the Word. *But, say you, not intending to wait for his Answer, I must tell him that both his Senses are absolutely false.* [Very strange, Sir, that both the general and special or particular Sense

Sense of the Church of Christ must be false. But I must confess I never knew it before. But if indeed they are both false, I must entreat you to shew me the true Sense of these Words; or, if you can, any truer Sense of them, than when they are used to signify either the universal or any particular Church of Christ. For if they are falsely used or abused, when they are used in either of those Senses, I must acknowledge I have long abused and misapplied them, not only in my Conversation with Men, but in my Prayers to God. Wherefore, Sir, it will be great Charity in you to rectify this unfortunate Mistake, in which I have so long continued. For if it should be true, as you affirm, that both these Senses of those Words are false; that is, that the Church of Christ is not truly and properly used, when it is used to signify the Universal Church or any part of it; then I cannot conceive, that either the Church universal or any part of it is the Church of Christ. Sir, you are one of the most singular Adversaries in your way of writing, that I have ever yet had to deal with, both as to your Assertions and the pretended Proofs of them, as your following Words shew:] And, First, That the Church of Christ is not taken for Christianity, (you should have added my other Words, viz. or the whole Universal Church dispersed over the Earth,) I prove out of their own Definition of the Church in the 19th Article of the 39, which says thus, The Visible Church is a Congregation of faithful Men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be truly administered. That the Church of Christ, or Church of God, or the Catholick Church (all which signify the same thing) is taken for all Christianity, viz. for all pure Catholick or Orthodox Christianity, I have proved

proved above out of the Scriptures and St. Ignatius's Epistles to the Church of Smyrna: But lest I should seem to want proof, I will now prove it farther by uncontestable Authorities, whatever becomes of that Definition of a Church. [And glad I am of an occasion to bring new Proofs of it, though there is no need of them, because they will set the old true Notion of the Catholick Church in its proper light against your new and false Notion of it; and also show, that your Church in ancient Times was never esteemed more than a part of the whole Catholick Church or Universal Church of Christ.] A Synod of Egyptian Bishops being met in Council at Alexandria, directeth a Circular Letter, which they wrote in defence of their Patriarch Athanasius, thus: *The Synod convened from Egypt, Thebais, Pentapolis, and Livia, send greeting in the Lord to the Bishops of the Catholick Church in all Places:* Ταῖς ἀρχιεπισκοπαῖς καὶ ἐπισκοπαῖς ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς πανταχοῦ. Athanasii. Apol. in Val. 1. p. 722. And St. Cyril saith, Catech. xviii. That the Church is called Catholick, because it is diffused through the whole World, from one end of the Earth to another; and because it teaches all Doctrines, which Men ought to know, of things visible and invisible, of things in Heaven and in Earth, Catholically, i. e. Universally, without defect or difference; and because it subdues all sorts of Men, Princes and private Persons to Religion, and because it cures and universally heals all sorts of Sins both of Body and Soul. So Theophylact on 1. Cor. xii. καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, &c. The Catholick Church dispersed through the whole World, whose Body consists of all Churches every where, having Christ, (not any one Bishop) for its Head. So St. Athanasius, Quest. xxxvii. of the Parable of the Scripture, Tom. 11. p. 402. Ἐκκλησία

καθολικὴ καλεῖται, &c. The Church is called Catholick, because it is dispersed through the whole World. So St. Augustin, Epist. 107. says, *Quid cultus ejus per omnes pene mundi terminos emanavit Catholica vel universalis vocatur Ecclesia.* The Church is called Catholick or Universal, because its Religion is gone over all the Countries of the World. So Vincentius Lirinensis, Cap. iii. *In ipsa Catholica Ecclesia magnopere curandum est, &c.* We must earnestly take care to hold That in the Catholick Church, which was believed every where, always, and by all. And, Cap. xxv. *Ille est verus & germanus Catholicus, &c.* He is a true and genuine Catholick, who being fix'd and stable in the Faith, holds and believes only that which he knows the Catholick Church in old Times universally held. So our Countryman * Bede, ——— *Id est, præparent omnes Ecclesie per orbem, quæ unam Catholicam faciunt, panem & vinum in mysterium carnis & sanguinis Agni immaculati, qui abstulit peccata mundi.* That is all the Churches of the World, which make one Catholick Church, should prepare Bread and Wine for the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the immaculate Lamb, who took away the Sins of the World. And all this most agreeable to more ancient Notions and Authorities, as that of St. † Irenæus, Ἡ μὲν ὅλη ἐκκλησία. The Church of God dispersed over the Universal World unto the Ends of the Earth. To which add the Words in the Paraphrastical Epistle of St. Ignatius to the Philadelphians, *Μία ἡ ἐκκλησία, &c.* The one Church, which the Apostles founded by their Sweat and Labour from one end of the

* *Histor. Eccl. lib. 5. cap. 22.*

† *Adversus Hæreses, lib. 1. cap. 11.*

Earth to the other in the Blood of Christ. [So * *Ops. Milev. l. 2. p. 34. Ecclesiam Catholicam, quæ sit in toto terrarum orbe diffusa* ; The Catholick Church, which is diffused throughout the whole World. So † *Collat. Carth. cum Donat. p. 57. n. 55. Ecclesia Catholica, quæ toto, sicut de illâ divina testantur eloquia, terrarum orbe diffunditur* ; The Catholick Church, which as the Scriptures testify of it, is diffused throughout the whole World.]

I hope the concurrent Authority of so many old and authentick Testimonies are sufficient proof, that it is neither *absolutely* nor at all false, that the Church of Christ may be taken for all pure Apostolical Christianity, or for the Church of the Faithful dispersed over the Face of the Earth, at first called Catholick or Universal, because it consisted of all particular Churches of Christ through the whole World, according to that of St. || *Basil, εἰς λαὸς πάντες εἰς χεῖρὸν ἡλικιᾶτες, &c. All those that believe in Christ are one People; and there is but one Church of Christ, though in different Places,* [So the Church of Smyrna in the Inscription of their Epistle in *Eusebius's Ecclesiast. History, lib. iv. cap. xv. Πάντας ἃ μὲν πάντα τὸ πᾶν τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας πατριάρχαις* . To all the Diocesses of the holy Catholick Church in every Place. Where let me by the way observe, that if the holy Catholick Church and the Roman Catholick Church had signified the same, they might as well have said, To all the Diocesses of the Roman Catholick Church in every Place. In like

* See *l. 3. p. 61, 64. l. 4. p. 89.*

† See *Collat. Carthag. iii. p. 67. n. 7. p. 70. n. 51. p. 72. n. 72. p. 73. n. 82. p. 74. n. 89.*

|| *Epist. cccxciii.*

manner,

nämet, * *Saint Augustin, Ecclesia Catholica per totum orbem valide lateque diffusa*; The Catholick Church (not the Roman Catholick Church) is mightily diffused far and wide, throughout the World. So in his Epistle to Severinus, The Church is called Catholick, because it is diffused through the whole World.] So St. † Chrysostom, Αἱ μὲν πόλεις καὶ κώμαι ἐκκλησίαι· Churches in Cities and Provinces, tho' many in number, make but one Church; for Christ is every where in them, perfect and undivided. So Theophylact in 1 Cor. cap. i. Μία ἐκκλησία αὐτῷ πάντες οἱ υἱοί, &c. All the Faithful are but one Church, wheresoever they are. [So Apollinarius, *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. v. cap. xvi.* calls the Church of Christ, ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ πᾶσι καὶ ὑπὸ τῷ ἑσπέρῳ ἐκκλησία· The Universal and whole Church under Heaven. It would be strange, Sir, if the Church of Christ might not be taken for the Universal Church under Heaven, when they are thus reciprocally affirmed of one another, and signify the same thing. Thus we may say in our Language, the Church of Christ is the Universal Church, or the whole Catholick Church under Heaven and the Universal Church, or the whole Catholick Church under Heaven is the Church of Christ. For the Church of Christ is his mystical Body, of which he, and no other, is the Head and Archetypal High Priest; and the Universal Church of the Faithful, commonly called the Catholick Church, is that mystical Body; and therefore

* De vera religione, Cap. 6. & 25. See his Epist. 152. Contra Donatistas, p. 448. Epist. Emerito, 164. p. 480. Epist. Festo, 167. p. 490. lib. de Genesi c. 1. contra Faustum Manich. lib. 23. l. 9. & contra Adversar. legis, & prophet. lib. 2. cap. ult.

† Hom. cxlix. Tom. v.

the Church of Christ may be taken for the Universal, or if you please, for his Universal Church. Of which St. *Augustin de Catech. Rud. cap. iii.* speaks in these Words, *Ecclesia est populus Dei per omnes gentes, quod est corpus ejus* ; The People of God in all Nation is the Church, which is his Body.] This one whole Universal or Catholick Church of the Faithful, unanimously confessing the true Faith, and thereby being visibly distinguished in all Places from the *Ecclesie malignantium* & *Conventicula Hereticorum*, as * St. Cyril speaks, came to be called the visible Church ; When thou comest into any City, saith that Father, do not barely enquire where is the House of God, nor barely ask where is the Church ; but where the Catholick Church is : For this is the proper Name of this holy Mother of us all, the Spouse of our Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God. This visible Difference and Distinction of the Catholick Church professing the true Faith, and rightly administering the holy Sacraments in all Cities and Countries, from the Churches and Congregations of Hereticks and Schismatics, made the former, I say, be called the visible Church, because visible to all diligent Enquirers every where after the Catholick Church. And therefore that Definition* of the visible Church in the 19th Article of the 39, which you bring to prove that the Church of Christ cannot signify all Christianity, proves the contrary, because it is a Definition of the Catholick Church, which is [in its several Parts] a visible Church of Christ, or one (general Society or) Congregation made up of faithful Men in all Places, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments du-

* Catech. xviii, *ibid*,

by administred according to Christs Ordinance in all those things, that of necessity are requisite to the same; and by this preaching the Word purely and administring the Sacraments duly, the Catholick Church (the *Cætu Fidelium*) is still visible in all Places by its own Light, and visibly distinguished every where, à *Cætu malignantium*; as in *England*, and more particularly in *London*, our Church by its Catholick Purity in Doctrine, Worship, and Government, is visibly to be distinguished from yours.

III. I NEED say no more in defence of my Distinction, but on I must go, because otherwise it will be said, I could not answer what I omit. You say then, *It is but too apparent that this Distinction* (in the 19th Article) *cannot possibly be apply'd to innumerable Sects, who neither preach the pure Word of God, nor duly minister the Sacraments: Therefore it is false, that the Church of Christ can be taken to signifie all Christianity.* It is most true, Sir, that this Definition cannot possibly be applied to any Sects, and by consequence not to your Church, [which with all its Splendour and Greatness is but a Sect,] because the Word of God is not putely taught and preached, nor the Sacraments duly administred in it, that is, because it is not a Catholick Church. And I acknowledge it is false, that the Church of Christ in that proper Orthodox Sense can be taken for all Christianity in your meaning; but it is taken in as large a Sense in mine, as Christianity signifies the whole Catholick or Universal Church of the Faithful: In which Sense it is used by St. Ignatius in his Epistle to the *Magnesians*, *Ὁ γὰρ χριστιανισμὸς ἐν εἰς ἑσθαιουσὸν, &c.* Christianity [i. e. the Christian Church] came not over to the Jewish Church, but the Jewish Church

Church to Christianity: [And this is a proper and natural signification of the Word, seeing as *Alexander Alesius* saith, *Par. iv. Quæst. xi. Ecclesia tota est in Christianis, The whole Church is made up of Christians.*] I cannot deny but Christianity is also taken for the Christian Doctrine; but it also signifies *Christendom*, or the Catholick Church in which that Doctrine is professed. It is used so by *Marth. Paris, An. 1243. Congregati sunt Lugduni ex totius fere Christianitatis Latitudine Prelati.* It is used so in our Language; and to determine it to that Signification, I said, *The Church of Christ may be taken in as large a sense as Christianity; for the Universal Church, wheresoever dispersed over the World.* And what Church the Fathers meant by the Universal Church, is evident from the Citations above; even the Universal Church of the Faithful; of which the Church of *Rome*, while faithful, was only a part; and you know well enough, that I who followed them in my Distinction, used it in the same sense. Then you go on: *Suppose it might be taken in that large sense* (for Sects who neither preach the Word of God purely, nor duly administer the Sacraments) *yet he had no reason to suspect, but that I took it for the true Church only, to which the Promises of perpetual Duration were given, and the one Holy Catholick Apostolick Church, which soever it be, not including such pitiful Sects, as rise and fall in every Age.* Therefore it is evident he shut his Eyes here again, for fear of seeing the true sense of the Word. That Christianity or the Universal Church may be taken in the most general and improper sense of the Word, comprehending all Churches, as well heretodox as orthodox, sound as corrupt, those that do preach the Word of God purely and ad-

H

minister

minister the Sacraments duly, as well as those that do not; I have shewed above, and shall shew it again below, tho' you will not thank me for it, and I have also shewed that I did not take it in that sense. But that I had no reason to suspect, that you took it for the *true Church* only, the *one holy Catholick Apostolick Church*, or as you afterwards say you meant, *the holy Catholick Church which my Creed put me in mind of*, is most contrary to Reason; because I have told you I had all the reason imaginable to believe you took it for the *Roman Church*, which most absurdly usurps the Title of the *One holy Catholick Church* mentioned in the Creed, and most falsely pretends to be the only true Church; tho' it is neither the true Church nor a true Church of Christ, as true signifies sound and pure, nor the one holy Catholick Church mentioned in the Creed, nor a part of it, nor a holy Catholick Church, but only a part of the Church Universal in the most large and improper sense of the Word, which you gave me occasion to mention above. It is you therefore, Sir, who shut your Eyes against the true sense of the Word, and not I who used it in the ancient, common, true sense, for all the Churches of the Faithful which make up one holy Catholick Church, of which the Church of *Rome* was once a principal part, but [for some very corrupt Ages] hath not been such a part. It is you, I say, who shut your Eyes against the true authentick sense of the Word, taking *the Church of Christ*, as I have observed before, for your own particular Church exclusively of all others, as is plain from your own Words, by which you explain in what sense you understood the true Church of Christ, *viz.* That Church to which *the Promises of perpetual Duration were given*

given, that is, in the arrogant sense of Popish Writers, your own Church. So in your XVth Paragraph, It follows, say you, *that the Roman Catholick Church is the true Church: for some Church must be the true Church of Christ, and it can be none, to whom the Promises of Indefeasibility or perpetual Duration have not been made good: But these Promises have not been made good to any but the Roman Catholick Church.* Your Argument I shall consider in its proper place, but now only observe, that this absurd acceptation of the Church of Christ in its large general sense only for the Church of Rome, is contrary to the Testimonies above-cited, and in particular contrary to that Article of the Creed, *I believe in the holy Catholick Church*, as it is expounded by St. Cyril, and all others that expounded or paraphrased the Creed for 900 Years. So St. † *Augustin*, the great Doctor of the Latin Church, in his Exposition of the Creed: *Sancta Ecclesia nos sumus, &c. We are the Holy Church; but I do not so speak, as if I meant we who are here, who now heard me speak, but as many as are faithful in this Church, i. e. in this City, as many as are in this Region; this Province, as many as are beyond the Sea, as many as are in the whole World, because the Name of the Lord is praised from the rising of the Sun to the going down of the same; such is the Catholick Church our true Mother, the true Bride of the Bridegroom, let us know Her, because she is the Lady of so great a Lord.* So his CXX* Epist. to *Honoratus*: *The one Catholick Church, &c. Which is mightily dispersed over the whole World, and*

† Feria ii. post Dominicam Palmarum. Serm. iii. Tom. x.

* Cap. xvi.

extended to the most distant Nations. [But had *St. Augustin* believed, that the Church of *Rome* in virtue of Christ's Promises to *Peter*, had been the *one holy Catholick Church*, of which in so many places of his Works he declares Christ to be the Head; instead of describing the Catholick Church in the fore said manner, it would have been more natural and easy for him to have said, the *Roman Catholick Church*, or the *one Catholick Church*, which is the Church of *Rome*. I might, lastly, make the same Observation of what he saith of that Article in the || Creed, *I believe the Catholick Church*: Saith he, *Credimus Sanctum Ecclesiam, utique Catholicam, nam & heretici & schismatici congregationes suas Ecclesias vocant, &c.* but if the *Roman Church* or *Roman Catholick Church* be the same with the *Catholick Church*, it is matter of Wonder to me, that neither he, nor *Ruffinus*, nor *Cyril of Hierusalem*, nor any other ancient Expolitor of the Creed, should omit to acquaint the Christian World with such a fundamental sense or meaning of *I believe the Catholick* or *the holy Catholick Church*. Nay, I wonder that the *Nicene Fathers* should not give that Explication of it in the *Nicene Creed*, if the *Roman Church* were indeed the Church of Christ in its general sense, or the Catholick Church mentioned in the Creed; for if it were, it certainly was the common Interest of Christians to have it so explained then, as you teach it now. But to return from this Digression, to shew that the Church of *Rome* is not the Church of Christ in its large and general Signification, let us go on to] *St. * Cyprian*, who saith, *& Christom Ecclesia, &c. From Christ, the one Church was divided over many Members. In like manner, there*

|| De fide & Symbolo.

* Epist. 56. Ed. Oxon.

is one Episcopat diffused (through the Church) in an united number of many Bishops. So† Tertullian, Tot, & tanta Ecclesia, &c. Sa many and great Churches are that one and first Church of the Apostles, for which all are come; so all are First, and all Apostolical, while they all hold one Unity. This Church made up of the Union of all Churches, is that Church he calls the Spouse of Christ, out of which there is no Salvation; and he always speaks of the Church of Rome as a part * of it. || So Irenæus, in the place cited in the Margent, &c. Pray, Sir, see the Notes of the most Learned John Ernest Grabe upon the place in the Oxford Edition of Irenæus, where you see the Church of Rome is mentioned as a particular Church, in the same manner as other Members of the one holy Catholick Church. As other members of the Catholick Church, dispersed through the whole World, are mentioned in the third Chapter of his first Book, viz. those in Germany, Spain, Gaul; those in the East, in Egypt, Libya, &c. all as parts of that one Body of Christ.

† De Præscript. cap. 20.

* Percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas.—prædica est tibi Acbaia? Habes Corinthum; si longè es à Macedonia habes Philippas, habes Thessalonicenses; si autem Italia adjacet habes Romanos, unde quoque auctoritas præstet est, &c.

|| Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tui volumine omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximam, & antiquissimam, & omnibus cognita à gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro & Paulo Roma fundata, & constituta Ecclesia.—Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam propter potentiorē principatū necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam.

IV. So in the Sixth Canon of the First Council of Nice, It is clearer than the Sun (saith * one of your own, and one of the Greek Writers) that the Roman Church was taken by the Nicene Fathers, for a single Particular, and not for the Universal and Catholick Church, as now it is since absolute Monarchy was erected in the Church. Truly, in this Canon Roman and Catholick are as opposite, as universal and particular: So that the Roman Catholick Church is a Part and Member of the Universal Church, as the Churches of Alexandria and Antioch are: From whence it is plain, that they have lost all Shame, who deny the Bishop of Rome to have a particular Diocese committed to his Government, as if the whole Christian World were but his private and particular Diocese; which are the Inventions of Flatterers and obnoxious Men, who would defend their Privileges and Immunities against the common Aristocratical Government (of the Church,) that they may make the Pope the supreme Ordinary, and most properly a Bishop. So in || another place; In the nine first Centuries, in which eight General Councils had met, it was never heard or read, that the Roman Church was taken in any other notion or signification, than for a singular or particular Church, and a Member of the Church Universal, as the other Patriarchal Churches were, who were also call'd Apostolick Sees, as well as that of Rome, which hath only Primacy above others. I refer you also to his Book, *De Ecclesiastica & Politica Potestate*, first published at Paris MDCLXXXVI, and afterwards, as was

* Edmundus Rihorius *Hist. Conciliorum*, Edit. Coloniæ MDCLXXXIII. l. 1. p. 65. And, Neilus Archiepiscopus Thessalonicensis de primatu Papæ.

|| *Ibid.* p. 754, 755.

pretend.

pretended, at *Colen*, MDCXCI; and I should be glad to see it answer'd otherwise than by the Publick Censure, or perhaps by being put in the expurgatory Index or prohibited Books.

To the Testimony of *Richerius*, a Writer of your own Church, let me add one of greater Antiquity and Authority, viz. That of *Neilus*, who was Archbishop of *Theffalonica* before the taking of C. P. by the *Turks*, in his Discourse, *De Causis Dissidii Ecclesiarum Lat. Et Græcarum*, Πόσι τῷ αἰτίαι, &c. Why do you say so? For if none of the Catholick Churches contradict, or but one, or but a few, I agree: But seeing there are five Catholick [Patriarchal] Churches, and but one contradicts the rest, is it not reasonable they should all consent to establish a Doctrine with infinite Suffrages and so much Disquisition? — But say they [the Latins] which are the four Churches? For we have no Difference but with that of C. P. for the other three [of Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Antioch] are but Names without reality, as being under the Power of the Barbarians, having no Wisdom, and but little Ability to find out the Truth. Furthermore, these Churches were under the Power of the Barbarians in the time of the Seventh [General] Council, and yet were not depriv'd of their Rights, but their Catholick Metropolitans fill'd their respective Chairs by their Legates, and Pope Adrian approved the things that were done. And whereas you say, there is no Wisdom in those Churches, I desire to know what Wisdom you mean, internal spiritual Wisdom, or external, &c. And in the end of the Discourse; But when were these things so? Under what Emperor, or Bishop of Rome? Where are the Copies of those Letters [by which we were call'd to any Council] directed to the Emperor of the Romans, or our Church, or

to the other Catholick Bishops? Or, Where are the Letters sent from us to you, by which we desist'd coming to any Synod? Either let them be produced, or talk no more thus. And let so much suffice, that it is not lawful for the Church of Rome, by it self, to determine what belongs * in common to the [whole] Church; and how the doing so hath rent the Church of Christ, and is contrary to what the Laws and Constitutions of the Apostles and Fathers have ordain'd. So in his Discourse, De Primatu Papæ, he saith, That it would be very hard to circumscribe the Church to Rome, because that would make it little different from the low and narrow State of the Jewish Church. And again, It is false and contrary to the Manners and Institutions of the Apostles, to say that the Pope judgeth all, and is judg'd of none. For St. Paul communicated the Gospel, lest by any means he should run, or had run in vain; and Peter suffer'd himself to be reprov'd by Paul. How then can the Pope of Rome, like a Tyrant, presume to be unaccountable, who boasts that he is Peter's Successor, which is evidently false? For in the Case of Doctrine, Honorius is a proof to the contrary, who by the Judgment of the Sixth General Council was deliver'd up to an Anathema, Death itself not prevailing for his Absolution. And as for Matters of Life and Conversation, he as a Bishop, is subject to all the Laws that other Bishops are.

To this let me add the Testimony of the Great Nestarius, cited above. You say there is but one true Church, to which I agree, if you mean the Catholick Church, which according to our Doctrine is the Universal [Company or] Collection of all

* To wit & anathema.

Churches:

Churches : But I deny it, if you speak of any particular Church, as you imagine the Roman to be the only true Church ; which would be true, if there were no other Churches in the World ; but I cannot admit it of any one particular Church, for there are many true particular Churches in the World, and all are true, as far as they go by the Rule of right Doctrine, and follow the Faith of the Catholick Church, which is the Collection of all Churches. Wherefore you ought not to deny any one particular Church to be a true Church, though it were the least in the World. And I need not prove that the several particular Churches, when they are Orthodox, are true Churches, to any Man who is but tolerably versed in the Epistles of the Holy Apostles, the Canons of the Holy Councils, and the Writings of the Ancient Doctors. And that I may not produce many Authorities, let one suffice for all, I mean that of Celestinus Bishop of Rome, who, writing to Nestorius, saith, You know it was my Opinion, that unless you taught the same things of Christ our God, which the Church of Rome and Alexandria, and the whole Catholick Church holds, and as the Holy Church of the great Christian City [of Constantinople] taught, till the time that you were expell'd from the Communion of the whole Catholick Church. Here you see mention made of many particular Churches, and of the Roman among the rest ; and of one Catholick Church made up of the particular Churches ; which is the Oecumenical Collection of them all, p. 6, 7. So p. 8. How can a Man be saved out of the one Catholick and Apostolical Church ? But that according to our Doctrine is the Universal Collection of all particular Churches in all Places, but most especially of the four most Holy and Apostolical Patriarchal Churches

Churches of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, with those under the Bishop of Rome, when it happens he is not separate for any Innovations or particular Herefy. To the Testimony of these Oriental Bishops, let me add one out of many from another of their own Writers, Dr. Lawney, in his Epistle ad Raymundum Formentinum: The Holy Fathers in the first Nicene Council, which was General, did not call the Roman the Universal Mother Church. The Holy Fathers in the Council of Constantinople, which was General, did not call the Roman the Universal Mother Church. The Holy Fathers in the first Council of Ephesus, which was General, did not call the Roman the Universal Mother Church. The Holy Fathers in the Council of Chalcedon, which was General; did not call the Roman the Universal Mother Church. The Holy Fathers, in the second Constantinopolitan Council, which was General; in the third Constantinopolitan Council, which was General; in the second Nicene Council, which was also General; did not call the Roman the Universal Mother Church. The Holy Fathers in their Writings and Acts, Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Eusebius, Athanasius, Optatus, Hilarius, Basilus, Gregorius Nyssenus, Gregorius Nazianzenus, Siricius, Damasus, Ambrosius, Epiphanius, Chrysostomus, Hieronymus, Augustinus, Celestinus, Leo Maximus, Chrysologus, Fulgentius, Gregorius Magnus, did not call the Roman the Universal Mother Church.

But, Sir, besides the Proofs already brought, it is evident from the Titles which the Bishops of Rome gave themselves, and which others gave them, that the Church of Rome was always look'd upon in ancient Times as a particular Church.

In

In the Fragments of *Hilary*, there is this Address of *Liberius*, *To our most Beloved Brethren and Fellow Bishops in the East* † *Liberius Bishop of the City of Rome*. And Pope *Zozimus* address'd himself in this manner to *Hefychius*, *Zozimus Bishop of the City of Rome* to *Hefychius Bishop of Salonia* *. *Leo I.* in his Epistles often uses the same Title, and without *City* sometimes calls himself *Bishop of Rome* ‥. *John I.* uses the same stile in these Words: *John Bishop of the City of Rome, sendeth greeting to Zachary Archbishop* †. So * *John II.* in his two first Epistles to the Emperor: *John Bishop of the City of Rome, to Justin the Emperor*. And so in his three Epistles to the Senators, *Johannes Romanus Episcopus, John the Roman Bishop to the most Illustrious, &c.* ‥ *Pelagius II.* in his ivth Epistle to *Auxanius* styles himself in the same manner. Nay, *Pius II.* in his Epistle *ad Martin Meyrum*, wrote like *Aneas Sylvius* in this old Stile: *Commendandi sunt & alii Romanae Urbis Praefules*: And other Bishops of the City of Rome are to be praised, &c. So *Julius* and *Liberius* are both stiled by † *St. Athanasius* in common with other Bishops, *Julius and Liberius Bishops of Rome*. The former is also stiled by him *Bishop of Rome* in his Apology, p. 754 & 767, and other Places, tho' if any other Bishop or Patriarch ever had reason to speak more magnificently of the Bishops of Rome, he certainly had, whose Person and Cause was supported by them in the *Arian* Persecutions.

† In the v Century.

* In the v Century, Anno 416.

‥ In the v Century, Anno 440.

† In the vi Century;

Anno 523

* In the vi Century, Anno 532.

‥ In

the vi Century, Anno 579,

† *Contra Arian. Orat. i. vol. i.**Edit, Paris. MDCXXVII, p. 291.*

Gregory

Gregory Nazianzen in Orat. LII. calls Pope Damasus barely Bishop of Rome. St. Hierom in his *Chronicon* saith that Damasus was ordained the *xxxv* Bishop of the Roman Church, and so he styles him in many other Places. So Pope Julius is stiled *Ἰούλιος ὁ Ρωμαίων ἐπίσκοπος*: *Julius Bishop of Rome*: Sozom. *Hist. Eccl.* l. 1. c. 17. in the same manner as Macarius is called Bishop of Jerusalem, Eustathius Bishop of Antioch, and Alexander Bishop of Alexandria. And in Sozom. *Hist. Eccl.* l. 4. c. 12. Pope Liberius is not only called Bishop of Rome and Bishop of the Romans by the Historian; but Eustathius and other Bishops sent a Letter with this Inscription, *αὐτῷ ἀδελφῷ καὶ συνλατρίῳ ἀδελφῷ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ἀδελφοῦ καὶ συνμισθροῦ Λιβηρίου* to our Lord, and Brother, and Fellow-Minister Liberius. So St. Cyprian frequently calls the Bishops of Rome his Brethren, Co-Bishops, and Colleagues, as in Ep. 9. upon the News of Pope Julius's Death, *De excessu Boni Viri Collegæ mei Rumor apud nos incertus est*: The Report among us of the Death of that Good Man our Colleague is uncertain. So Ep. 55. *ad personam Cornelii Collegæ nostri*: Unto the Person of Cornelius our Colleague. And the Inscription of Ep. 72. is *Cyprianus & ceteri Stephano Fratri*: Cyprian and the other Bishops to (Pope) Stephen our Brother. He writes often in the same stile to Cornelius. And in Concil. Carthag. T. 229. *Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se Episcoporum constituit, aut Tyrannico Terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem Collegas suos adigit; quando habeat omnis Episcopus, pro licentiâ libertatis & potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non posset, quam nec ipse potest judicare, sed expellemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus & solus habet potestatem, & praponendi nos in Ecclesiæ suæ Gubernatione,*

et de actu nostro judicandi. Sir, I pray you to translate this faithfully to your Prolelytes; and then do not tell them, as *Pamelius* falsely saith, that *St. Cyprian* learned this way of speaking from *Tertullian* the Montanist. For in his Epistle *ad Quintum*, he saith of *St. Peter*, that he never claim'd any thing by force, or arrogantly assum'd the *Stile* of *Primacy* to himself. The Inscription of *Ep. 57.* is *Cyprianus, Liberalis*, and above thirty Bishops more, *Cornelio Fratri Salutem*, send Greeting to *Cornelius* our Brother. And in the *Gesta Purgationis Caeli et Felicis*, *Marianus Acasius* writes, *Dilectissima Papa Sylvestro*: To the most beloved *Papa Sylvester*, p. 98. So p. 99. *Frater charissimo*: Most dear Brother: And *à te qui majores Dioceses tenes*, *Eusebius* in his *Chronicon* saith, that *Peter* was the first Bishop, *Linas* the second, and *Clemens* the third of the *Roman Church*. The Council of *Serdia* sometimes calls the Pope; the *Roman Bishop*, sometimes Bishop of the *Roman Church*, and sometimes our *Fellow-Bishop*. You may see many more Authorities of this kind and to this Purpose, in the fore-cited learned Writer, in his Epistle *ad Ramundum Formantinum*, where he confutes *Bellarmin*, and proves the Pope to be but one particular Bishop of the *Catholic Church*, because when a Pope dies there is only a *Vacancy* of the Church of *Rome*, but not of the *Catholic Church*. To the same Purpose speaks *Neilus* in the Tract last cited: It is an evident Contradiction to say the Pope is not Bishop of a particular Place, but that he is called absolutely Bishop. For first I have shew'd above, that he is of the same Order with other Bishops; and that as often as there is occasion to mention him in the General Councils, which
often

often happens, they call him Bishop of Rome: And how can the Bishop of Rome be otherwise than a Bishop of a certain Place, unless they will deny Rome to be circumscribed by Place?

SIR, I think my self very unfortunate to have to do with an Adversary, who puts me upon proving that a part is not the Whole, nor a particular a General, nor a Member the whole Body of Christ: But I have been forc'd to make Proof of this, which one would wonder should not appear to be self-evident to any common Understanding; and such a plain Contradiction it is, that the * learned Writer cited in the Margent asserts, if the Church of Rome were in your sense the *Holy Catholick Church* or the *One Holy Catholick Church*, then the Catholick Church dispers'd every where would be but one Diocess, and by consequence there would be but one Bishop of it, because the rest of the Bishops would all be nominal Bishops or Vicars of the Pope. He also observes, that from the Doctrine of the Church of Rome being the *One Holy Catholick Church*, it must follow that the Pope is the *Universal* or *Oecumenical Bishop*. A Title, saith he, which the Apostolick See condemned twelve times by the Pen of Gregory I. † I refer you to him in the Margent; and beseech you, if you can, to give him a fair and solid Answer.

I will conclude all with what *Barlaam* the Greek Monk saith on this Subject.

But because you (Latins) profess to believe in the *Roman Church* and *Roman Faith*, and force others so to believe, it concerns us to discourse of

* *Johannes Launojus in Epist. V. ad Francis. Bonum.*

† *Hic gradum sisto, &c. Ibid. See also his Epist. ad N. Gallican.*

this Matter. Our Holy Fathers speak in a different manner of the Roman Church and the Catholick Church. For when they speak of the Catholick Church, they understand the Congregation of all Christians throughout the World, who keep the Doctrines of Religion entire and unchanged. But when they speak of the Roman Church, they speak of it as the Council of Carthage did in the CIV Canon, to distinguish it from other particular Churches in the World in this manner. It is resolved that Letters be written to the most Holy Pope Innocent, about the Difference that is arisen between the Church of Rome and Alexandria, that both Churches may keep the Peace between themselves which Christ hath commanded. For no Man instead of saying the Catholick Church, ever said the Roman Church. In like manner when they speak of the Catholick Faith, they understand that Faith, which all Orthodox Christians in all Places profess. And no Man, who is not mad, ever call'd the Christian Faith the Roman Faith. For we are commanded not to believe in the Roman Faith and Church, but in the common Catholick Faith and Church, which Faith and Profession we have kept, and will keep by God's help unto the end. Did any Confessor before a Tyrant or Penitent Heretick in the Confession of his Faith ever say, I believe in the Roman Faith and Church? Whoever required such a Confession of any that is destructive of our Religion? Wherefore it neither becomes us to say, we believe in the Roman Church, nor you to say that you believe in the Catholick Church. For it is necessary for us to continue to observe the Laws of the Catholick Church, and to retain its Traditions entire and pure, to profess we believe in it, whose Doctrines we observe. But you who have rejected the Traditions of

of the Catholick Church, of which you make no Account, and have introduced other strange Doctrines instead of them: With what Decency can you profess to believe in that Church, which you have rejected? Therefore it was fit for you to set up the Roman Church in Opposition to the Catholick Church, for so you evidently shew that you have fallen from the Communion of the Catholick Church. Indeed with Shame and remorse of Conscience you pretend to keep the Constitutions of the Church of God, and of the Holy Apostles, and of our Holy Fathers; but then if any one ask you, how it comes to pass that you transgress this or that Constitution? You fly to the Power of the Pope as your Refuge; like the Tyrants, who when they could not persuade the Martyrs by Words, were not ashamed to make them Examples of the Power.



CHAP. VI.

HAVING made good the first Member of my Distinction, in which I said the Church of Christ may be taken in as large a Sense as Christianity or the Universal Church, and shew'd that the Roman Church was never taken for the whole Catholick Church; I must now proceed to consider what you say against the second Member of it, in which I said that the Church of Christ may also be taken for some part of the Universal Church; at which in one of your Figures of Oratory, you make an Exclamation like a Man astonish'd in these Words: *But yet, says he, the Church of Christ may be taken for one or more particular Churches, but not the Universal Church.*

Church. Behold, Sir, the dissingenuous trifling of the Gentleman, who is resolv'd to take the Word in all other Senses but the right one. Behold, Sir, your own Assurance, by which you go about to persuade your Disciples, that the Church of Christ cannot be used to signify a part of his Universal Church. I think I have sufficiently proved above, that *the Church, the Church of God, the Church of Christ, the Catholick Church* are familiarly used in this special Sense [both absolutely and in opposition, or if you please both implicitly and explicitly, of which, to abate your Confidence, suffer me to give you some more Proofs. They are taken absolutely and implicitly for the Church of Rome in † Pope Cornelius's Synodical Epistle, which he sent to the Bishops of the other Churches, to notify the return of the Confessors to him from his Rival Novatians. They, saith he, *discerning his Fraud, and Lyes, and Perjury, came back from him into the Holy Church*, meaning the Church of the Faithful at Rome, in Communion with himself. So in his * Epistle to St. Cyprian Bishop of Carthage, giving an Account of the same Matter. *We* (saith he, speaking of them) *acknowledge Cornelius, who was elected by Almighty God and Christ our Lord, to be the Bishop of the most Holy Catholick Church*, understanding the Catholick Church of his Communion at Rome. This is plain from other Expressions of Cornelius in that Epistle, as *ad Ecclesiam unde exierant, venerunt*; *They came to the Church from whence they went*; that is, *to the Catholick Communion or Church of Cornelius at*

† Eusebius's Hist. Eccl. lib. vi. c. xliii. eis * ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

* Ep. 49. Edit. Oxon. Nos, inquirunt, Cornelium Episcopum Sanctissimæ Catholica Ecclesiæ, &c.

Rome. So speaking of *Urbanus* and *Sidonius* the Confessors, *They came*, saith he, *to our Presbyters* to tell them, that *Maximus* the Confessor and Presbyter desired to return with them † into the Church, that is, into the Church at *Rome*, which was in himself, and not in *Novatianus* his schismatical Rival and *Anti-Pope*. As for their other Phrase in that Epistle, *Non ignoramus unum Episcopum in Catholica Ecclesia esse debere*, it is to be translated thus in an indefinite Sense, *We are not ignorant that there should be but one Bishop in a Catholick Church*, and not in the *Catholick Church*. This I prove from *Eusebius's* Words in the fore-cited Synodical Epistle, which are not ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, in the Catholick Church, but ἐν καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, in a Catholick Church. But to proceed; *St. Cyprian* in the beginning of his * Epistle to *Antonianus*, twice uses the Words the Catholick Church, in this special Sense, meaning the particular Church of *Rome* under *Cornelius*, as distinguished from the schismatical Church of that Place, under the Usurper *Novatianus*; and I have cited the Passage in the || Margin for the Proof of what I say against the false Gloss of *Valesius*, in his Notes on *Euseb. Eccl. Hist. Lib. vi. C. xliii.* In the same special Sense he uses the Words *Catholick Church* for the Church of *Rome* under *Cornelius*, as distinguished from

† In Ecclesiam.

* Ep. 55.

|| Accepi primas Literas tuas, Frater charissime, Concordiam Collegii Sacerdotalis firmiter obtinentes, & Catholica Ecclesia coherentes, quibus significasti cum Novatiano te non communicare, sed sequi concilium nostrum, & cum Cornelio Coepiscopo nostro unum tenere consensum. Scripsisti etiam ut exemplum earundem Literarum ad Cornelium Collegam nostrum transmitterem, ut sciret te secum, hoc est, cum Catholica Ecclesia communicare.

that

that under *Novatianus*, and for his own Church of *Carthage*, as distinguished from that of his Rival *Fortunatus* in his lix. Ep. to *Cornelius*, as you will see below; and if you desire more Examples of this Kind, to shew that *the Church, the Church of Christ, the Catholick Church*, may be used specially to denote particular Churches, I will give you more when you please.] But, Sir, had I been in an Error, did it become you to exclaim against me, for saying the Church of Christ may be taken for a particular Church; you, who most abusively apply *the Church, the Church of Christ, the true Church of Christ, the Catholick Church, the Holy Catholick Church, the one Holy Catholick Church*, in the most general Sense of the Words, as they signify the whole Body of Christ made up of all the faithful Churches in the World, to the Roman Church? If it be *disingenuous trifling in me* to say, *the Church of Christ*, meaning in its strict particular Sense, may be used to signify particular Churches, how much more disingenuous, trifling, and absurd is it in you to use it in the general Signification (as you * do in the last Words of your Query) for your own particular Church? St. Cyprian, Bishop of *Carthage*, uses the Words *Catholick Church* in the former Sense both for his own Church and for that of *Rome* in his Epistle to Pope *Cornelius*, which in *Pamelius's* Edition is the 55th, in the *Oxford* the 59th, *Neque enim ad Catholice Ecclesie majestatem pariter ac dignitatem pertinere debet, &c.* Neither, saith he, doth it concern the Grandeur and Dignity of the Catholick Church, what the Impudence of Hereticks and Schismaticks enterprize among

* In these Words, Before your Separation from the Holy Catholick Church, or from the Roman Catholick Church.

themselves; in which Place he is so trifling, as to take the *Catholick Church* in a particular Sense for the *Roman Church*; and in the next Period he uses the Words *absolutely* in the same Sense again, for the *African Churches*, which in him were united into one particular Metropolitick Church, *Quando miserim tibi proxime nomina Episcoporum——qui integri & sani in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ fratribus præsunt: Seeing I sent you the Names of the Bishops, who being entire and sound, are set over the Brethren in the Catholick Church.* An Expression, saith your Learned Sorbon Doctor * *Launoy*, in which, when it is used in the Titles or Supercriptions of Popes, who anciently stil'd themselves *Bishops of the Catholick Church*, these Words always ought to be understood, *Urbis Romæ*, of the *City of Rome*. So Pope *Felix* in his fourth Epistle to *Zeno* the Emperor, speaking of *Peter* the *Eutychian Bishop of Alexandria*; saith, *That he who receiv'd a false Priesthood from Hereticks (Catholicæ non poterat Ecclesiæ præfidere) could not preside over the Catholick Church, i.e. the Catholick Church of Alexandria, so call'd, because it was a Member of the Catholick Church.*

II. THEN you go on: Suppose I should say, *the Kingdom of England is a rich and glorious Nation, see how he would raise Difficulties upon those clear Words. What means he by the Kingdom of England? Does he mean Somersetshire alone, or Somersetshire, Wiltshire, and Berkshire? Or England, Denmark, and Norway? Just so, when I said the Church of Christ cannot perish, he answers, What means he by the Church of Christ? Sir, if this Argument which you bring as a Simile,*

* In Ep. IV. ad Franciscum Bonum.

proves

proves any thing against me, it proves ten times more against you ; who taking the Church of *Rome* for the whole Church of Christ, and the whole Church of Christ for the Church of *Rome*, are as absurd, as a *Somersetshire* Man would be, who took the whole Nation for the County of *Somerset*, or the County of *Somerset* for the whole Nation, because perhaps he had heard King *Alfred* sometime kept his Court there. But in truth, your Similitude is not just, and by Consequence proves nothing, because there is a great difference betwixt a Kingdom or a Nation, and the Provinces or Countries of it ; and the whole Church of Christ, commonly call'd the Catholick Church, which is dispers'd over the Earth, and the particular Churches Metropolitick, Patriarchal, Diocesan, or Parochial, which are Parts thereof. A Kingdom or Nation is a *heterogeneous* Body or *Whole*, whose Parts are not of the same Nature with it and with one another, but of a different Denomination and Nature from it and from one another : And therefore if you should say that the Kingdom of *England* was a rich and glorious Nation, it would be most absurd to ask you, if you meant *Somersetshire*, or any other County ; because *Somersetshire* hath not the Name or Nature of a Kingdom, as the Kingdom of *England*, of which it is a part, hath. But *the Church*, or *Church of Christ*, or *the Catholick Church*, is an *homogeneous* Body, which hath Parts of the same Nature with the whole and with one another ; and therefore every part of it is aptly call'd by the Name of the whole, as in other *homogeneous* Bodies. For Example, every Grain or Wedge of Gold is Gold ; and every drop of Milk is, and is therefore call'd Milk : And in the Sea, every part of it, as the *Ægean*, the *Euxine*, the *Baltick*, are absolutely

lutely call'd the Sea. Thus the Sea of *Tiberias* is absolutely call'd the Sea in the New Testament; and the *Red Sea* in the Old Testament is perhaps above one hundred times absolutely call'd the Sea: And I have proved every particular Church may be absolutely call'd the *Church*, or the *Catholick Church*, or *the Church of Christ*, always meaning the Church or Catholick Church of that Place, whose Name is understood. Thus to put an end to this part of the Controversy, I may properly say of any faithful Bishop; that he is a Bishop of *the Church*, or of *the Church of Christ*, or of *the Catholick Church*, always understanding that part of the whole Church, or that particular Place of which he is Bishop; as the Penitent Presbyters † in *St. Cyprian*, who returning from the *Novatians* acknowledged *Cornelius* to be a Bishop of the most holy Catholick Church; not in your most absurd general, but in the particular Sense of the Words, understanding the *Catholick Church of Rome*, of which he was the first and rightful Bishop, in Opposition to *Novatianus* his Rival; whose Church was no part of the holy Catholick Church, as being the Schismatical and not the Catholick Church of *Rome*. [As for the other part of your Reply in these Words, *viz.* If I should say, *The Kingdom of England was a rich Nation*; he would say, *What mean you by the Kingdom of England?* England, Denmark, and Norway? It is trifling and sophistical in the highest Degree, and as such unworthy of a Casuist, and as a Casuist and Divine, you ought to be ashamed of it. Because the Adjunct *England* determines the general Signification of Kingdom to a particular Realm, as *France* in this Expression,

† *Epist. XLIX. Edit. Oxon. Pamellii XLVI.*

The Church of France or the Church of Christ in France determines the general sense of *the Church*, or *the Church of Christ*. to a particular Church. This you could not but know, though you made no Conscience by such a sophistical Comparison, to make your Profelyte believe, that my asking you what you meant by *the Church of Christ*, which hath no Adjunct to determine or particularize its general Signification, was as absurd, as if you should say, *The Kingdom of England was a rich Nation*; I should then ask you, *what you meant by the Kingdom of England*? England, Denmark, and Norway? That is, if by one particular Kingdom particularly named, you meant three. Indeed, if by the Kingdom of *England* I had asked you, if you meant *England, Denmark, and Norway*, I should have been as absurd and impertinent as you would make me; even as impertinent and absurd, as if I had asked you, speaking of *the Church of France*, if you meant the Church of *France*, and any two or three Churches more; but I think it was no such Impertinence or impropriety to ask you, what you meant by the indefinite or undetermined Expression in your Supposition, *the Church of Christ*.] But if it were, you can shew it, and then I will submit. Then you add, *as if the most extravagant Heresies were a part of the Church*; no indeed, Sir, not of the Church of Christ, in my proper Signification of the Words, for the Universal Church of the Faithful; much less can extravagant Heresies, of which Popery (*as Popery*) is one, be the whole Catholick Church: Or *as if one or two particular Churches*. [say you] *were the Church of Christ, and not rather a part of it*. This, Sir, is crudely expressed, because one or two Churches may happen to be the whole Church of Christ, when

I 4.

there

there are no more, as first *Hierusalem*, and then *Hierusalem* and *Antioch* were, before there was a Church of *Rome*, which, I put you in mind of; First, to shew that the Church of Christ was extant before the Church of *Rome*, and by Consequence that your Church cannot be the one holy Catholick Church; and, Secondly, to shew you that the Church of *Rome* may perish as other Churches have done, and yet Christ may have a Catholick Church on Earth, after she is no more a Church, as well as before she was one. Secondly, as that is a crude, so it is a fallacious Expression; for I never asserted, as you falsely suggest, that one or two particular Churches were, or could be the Church of Christ; but that these Words, *the Church of Christ*, might be used to signify a part of Christ's Church, comprehending one or more Churches; but when they are so used and applied, they do not signify that the particular Church or Churches, for which they are implicitly used, is the whole Church of Christ. No, Sir, 'tis you and such *Curial* Writers of your Church as you, that not only abuse those Words in their general Sense, to signify your own particular Church, but abuse them with a design to make the Unlearned and Unskilful believe, that it is *the whole Church of Christ, the one holy Catholick Church*; of which, were it as pure and sound as in St. Peter's Time, it could be but a part; and in St. Clement's Epistle above-cited, it is spoken of as such. Lastly, To create a confidence in your Disciples, you conclude with triumphant Reflections: *But these Gentlemen are grown so much Strangers to Christ's Church, that when it is nam'd, they lift up their Heads and know not what it means. Therefore, if he had been so minded, he might easily have known, that by the* Church

Church of Christ I meant the holy Catholick Church. Yes, Sir, I know very well that you meant the holy Catholick Church in your own abusive sense of the Words, but not in the true Primitive Notion of it, for the Society or Company of all the Faithful dispers'd through the World, over which Christ is the Head; but in the false modern Notion of *Cardinal Peron*, of which more hereafter, and according to the new Definitions of *Canisius* and *Cardinal Bellarmin*, which Dr. * *Launoy*, who learnedly defends the old Definition against their new ones, truly saith is accommodated to the present state of the Church (meaning your Monarchy of the Church) and not to the Nature, Constitution, and Interest of the Church of Christ. *Canisius* concludes his Definition of the Church in these Words, *which is govern'd and preserv'd in its Unity, under its own Head Christ, and his one Vicegerent the chief Pontif, meaning the Bishop of Rome.* *Bellarmin*, whose Popery it seems you are not yet ashamed of, speaks yet plainer, *defining the Church to be one true Congregation of Men united together in the Profession of the same Faith and Communion of the same Sacraments, under the Government of lawful Pastors, but especially the one Vicar of Christ upon Earth.* This, Sir, is the Catholick Church you mean, which is very contrary to the Nature of the true Catholick Church, and the old Principle of Catholick Unity, as taught and practis'd in the former and purer Ages of the Church. † Then the Catholick Church was not understood to have any one common Head but Christ; then every faithful Bishop

* In his *Ep. ad. Nic. Gatineum*. † See a Book intituled, *The Principles of the Cyprianick Age*, printed for *Walt. Kettilby*.

was

was thought to be his Vicar and Vicegerent over his Flock, as much as the Bishop of *Rome* is over his, and every other Metropolitan independent of him at *Rome*. * Nay, after the Creation of Patriarchates, the rest were all co-ordinate with him of *Rome*. As he had his *Urbicarian* Jurisdiction, so they had theirs; the Church of *Rome* then first one of the Four, afterwards one of the Five Patriarchates, as to Catholick Union and Communion, was no more than one of the rest. Indeed, Sir, *we cannot but lift up our Heads* in Astonishment at the Flattery of your *Curial* Writers, who by their new Notions and Definitions have quite perverted the ancient Doctrine of Church Government, and the *Aristocratical* Constitution of the Church. The Church of Christ's Foundation, and those Definitions are inconsistent one with the other: And so far are we from being *Strangers* to the former, that our certain knowledge of its Constitution makes us still oppose the latter, as † *Richerius*, *Launoy*, and *Dupin*, and many other of your own best Writers have done to their Immortal Praise; who have baffled the Sovereignty of the Roman Pontiff, and the new Curial Notion of Catholick Communion and the Catholick Church. But, Sir, it had been enough in a modest Adversary to reflect upon me alone, and not upon my Brethren, if I had been such a Stranger to what is meant by the *Church of Christ*. For the Clergy of the Church of *England* are not answerable for my Ignorance, or for my voluntary or involuntary Faults, had I committed any such. And whether you or I best

* See Dr. *Cave*'s ancient Government of Churches, and Dr. *Sam. Parker*'s Hist. of the first six Centuries of the Church.

† See their Works cited in this Answer.

know

know what the Church of Christ means, which is called in our Creed the Holy Catholick Church, and not the *Roman* Catholick Church, let the World judge from what I have written in this Answer to your Reply. I knew the meaning of it so well, and your meaning too, that I knew they were as opposite to one another, as Truth is to what is False; you always sophistically meaning, as I have shew'd, the Roman Church by *the Church of Christ* or *the Holy Catholick Church*, of which it was never more than a Part; and the Creed meaning all the faithful Churches in the World, which make up the mystical Body of Christ; otherwise, as the Greek Writers have told you, it would be all one to say, I believe in *the Roman Catholick Church*, as to say, I believe in *the Holy Catholick Church*. You perceiv'd by my Distinction, that I discern'd your absconded false meaning of those Words from the true one, and that oblig'd you to treat it and me in such a scurrilous and scornful manner. To which perhaps you were the more encourag'd by being unknown; and because Boldness commonly passes for Argument in the Opinion of unskilful and unexperienc'd Judgments, who cannot think that an *approv'd* Guide in Controversies of Religion, who talks and writes with so much Assurance, can be in the wrong. When I had told you that your one Query, *Where the Protestant Church was before Luther*, was as many as there were Protestant Churches, and therefore desired to know, which of the Protestant Churches you meant; then I put you in mind, that this uncertain Phrase, *Protestant Church*, when it was determin'd, might be taken either for *the Clergy and People of the Protestant Church*, or *the Faith, Worship, and Polity of it*; And if you would tell me, that by the

Protestant

Protestant Church, you meant the Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Church of *England*, and not the Succession of Clergy and People teaching and professing that Faith, &c. then I would tell you where the Church of *England* was many hundred Years before *Luther*, even where the present Faith, Worship, and Polity of your Church never was, viz. in the *Primitive Church*. One would think this was a very obvious plain Distinction, and a fair Offer; but you are always angry at my Distinctions, because they detect your Fallacies. Therefore let us see how worthily you treat this part of my Answer in the Fifth Paragraph of your Reply: *He*, says you, *still finds more Difficulties in understanding this Phrase, as he calls it*, the Protestant Church. *As he calls it*: Pray, Sir, is the Word *Phrase* of my Invention? Or, am I the first user of it? Is it not a Word of common usage in our Language, for a fashion or way of speaking? And what other fitter Name should I have given that loose Expression of yours? If you know one more proper, tell it me, and I shall use it: For *Ἐπίγνω ἀνθρώπων*, as old as I am, I am willing to learn. [I go on in your Words;] For, saith he, *it may either signify the Clergy and People of the Church, or the Faith, Worship, and Polity of it. Why had we not this Difficulty started before, when we had the former Dispute about the Word Church, that we might have done with it once for all? I defy him to give a Reason, except that the Fancy bit now and not then, or else perchance because he was resolved to have a new Cavil in reserve for this Place.* Yes, Sir, I still maintain, that in Answer to a Query about the Age of any Protestant Church, and particularly our own, it is most proper to distinguish betwixt the Clergy and People, and

and the Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Church ; because the Faith, Worship, and Polity of a Church formed or reformed, may be much older than the Church it self. But why do I say *may be* ? For they *must be older* than a *Reformed Church*, which is supposed to have been depraved some time and in some degree from the pure Faith, or Worship, or Polity, or altogether, which it formerly professed. This Distinction you rightly call a Difficulty as to your self, because it brought a Difficulty upon you which you could not answer. For according to this Distinction which the Understanding will make, when Enquiry is made about the Age of Churches, I told you a fair and learned Adversary would have put the Question thus : *I desire to know where the Church of England, or where your Religion was many hundred Years before your pretended Reformation?* But you durst not put the Question so plainly and honestly, as I observed in my Answer ; but expressed your self so in your Challenge, which is an Explication of your Query, as if you desired to know where the Clergy and People of the Protestant Church, as *Protestant*, were before *Luther*. Name, say you, *your Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay, one single Congregation or Village of Protestants, for 900 or 1000 Years before your Separation from the holy Catholick Church.* This made me tell you, that you might as well have ask'd me, where our Protestant Kings and Courts were before *Edward VI.* And this was the Reason, the true and obvious Reason, which you could not but discern, why I used that Distinction where I did, and why I used it not before ; because tho' there could be no Protestant Clergy and People of the Church of *England*, before the Church protested against Popery and reformed from

from it, and so the Protestant Church of *England*, as to the Clergy and People of it, could be no older than the Reformation; yet as to the Faith, Worship, and Polity of it, it was as old as the Primitive Church. Then you proceed: *And when all is done, the Difficulty is none: For by the word Church, is properly meant a Congregation of faithful Men; so it is in divers others, even heretical Definitions;* (I presume you mean the Definitions which Hereticks give of the Church.) All this, Sir, by your Favour is a meer Impertinence, and nothing to the Purpose; a meer Shift to elude the application and force of my Distinction. For a *Church* and a *Congregation of faithful Men*, differ no more than the Definition and the Thing defined, as a *Man* and a *Rational Creature*; and what may be affirmed or denied of the one, may be affirmed or denied of the other; and what Distinction is applicable to the one, is as applicable to the other: As for Example, it is all one to say, a *Man* or a *Rational Creature* may be considered, as to his Body or as to his Soul. And so it is all one to say, a *Church* or a *Congregation of faithful People* may be considered with respect to the Men, or with respect to the Faith, Worship, and Polity which they profess and practice; and if these are different *Respects* or *Formalities* of such a *Congregation*, then it may be distinguished into those *Respects*, and sometimes be understood and taken in one *Respect*, and sometimes in the other. In that [* old Orthodox] Definition of a *Church*, a *Congregation of faithful Men*, which is the Predicate, and the Faith, Worship, and Polity which they hold, form different Conceptions or Ideas,

* See Dr. *Launoy's* Epist. ad *N. Gatinaum*.

and therefore differ formally from one another ; and because they are different Conceptions and Ideas, the Understanding can, and will distinguish them, when it is necessary or expedient to state or answer any Question, as this captious one of yours, *where the Protestant Church of England was many hundred Years before Luther ?* Then it follows : *I do not remember to have read any where that Church is taken for the Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Church ; and if he have any where read it, yet he ought to reflect, that in reason he should have taken it in that sense, in which Divines of all sides take it commonly in this Dispute of the Church, viz. for a Congregation of faithful Men,* and not for the Faith, Worship, and Polity which they profess. Sir, I know not what Opinion your Disciples may have of your Memory and Reading ; but it is neither your Memory and Reading nor mine that must determine Disputes, or be the measure of Controversy between us : Nor is it the Question, whether you have read, much less whether you remember you have read, that the Church is taken for the Faith, Worship, and Polity, that is, for *the whole Constitution* of the Church ; but whether it may be so consider'd, and taken upon a clear and full Answer to such a fallacious Query as yours. The use and acceptation of all Words, whether in their literal or figurative sense, had once a beginning ; and whether this sense of the Church, which is one of the two, in which it is taken, hath been used before or no, is not material ; but whether upon this occasion, it is apposite and just. If you should see a Book with this Title : *Of the Difference between the Popish and the Primitive Church of Rome, or, Of the Difference between the ancient and modern Church of Rome,* would you think the Author treated of the difference of the
Men,

Men, or of the Faith, and Worship, and Government of the two distinguished Churches? Or, when any of your Religion say, as they say often, they hope to see *the old Catholick Church of England* set up in *England* again, do you think they mean the Men of that old Catholick Church, who are dead and forgotten, or the Faith, Worship, and Polity thereof? Or, suppose I should ask you this Question, *If the present Church of Rome be a true Catholick Church, I desire to know where it was 1400 or 1500 Years before the Council of Trent?* Would you think, Sir, I asked you in this Question, where the Men, or where the Doctrine, Worship, and Polity of your present Church were, so long before the Council of Trent? Lastly, Suppose a Monk of the unreformed Order of * *Citeaux* should go to *la Trappe*, and put this Query to the Fathers of the strict Reformed Order there; *If the Cistercian Order here be the true one, I desire to know where it was two hundred Years before your pretended Reformation by the Abbot de Rancé, and the other Fathers of la Trappe in 1662?* Sir, I suppose this Question ought to be understood by the common use of Speech, not of the Men, but of the Primitive Rules and Institutions of the *Cistercian Order*: And if a Religious Order [which agrees with the Church in this, that it is a Society] may be taken for its Rules and Institutions prescribed by the Founder or Reformer, as well as for the Men of it; then I hope it is no great impropriety to take the Word Church for the *Faith, Worship, and Polity of a Church*, which both make, and make known the Constitution thereof. But in this and your second Paragraph, you vehe-

* *Dictionnaire Historique & Critique de Monsieur Bayle.*

mently

mently accuse, and almost deride me, for not using Words in their most proper and obvious signification; which, Sir, you and your Writers should not do, because of all Men in the World you most pervert the established significations of Words, and abuse them in the most improper senses. Thus you do, when by *the Catholick, the holy Catholick*; or *the one holy Catholick Church*, you mean your own Church only; and when you confound the real and the corporal Presence of Christ in the holy *Eucharist*; and when pleading for your † Idolatrous Prayers to the Blessed Virgin in Words, which in their proper and received senses signify Divine Worship; or as *direct Invocation for temporal and spiritual Blessings* as any are used to God himself, you say you mean and intend no more than a desire that she should pray for you. *Lastly*, Tho' the *figurative*; and not the literal, is the true and proper sense, in which all Words and Sentences in holy Scripture are to be taken; which command us to do any flagitious thing; yet you take these Words in the literal sense, where our Saviour saith, *Unless ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink his Blood, you have no Life in you*; which St. *Austin*, the greatest Doctor of the *Latin Church*, saith, are to be taken in a figurative sense, because in the literal they command a heinous Crime. I will put down the Words, and leave you to translate them to your Disciples: * *Si praeceptiva locutio est aut flagitium, aut facinus verans, aut utilitatem, aut bene-*

† See *Speculum Beatae Virginis*, or a Discourse of the due Praise and Honour of the Virgin *Mary*, by a true Catholick of the Church of England. 1686.

* *Tom. 2. De Doctrina Christiana*, cap. 14. See also *Enarrat. in Psalm 98. Tom. 8.*

ficentiam jubens, non est figurata ; si autem flagitium, aut facinus videtur jubere, aut utilitatem, aut beneficentiam vetare, figurata est. Nisi Manducaveritis, inquit, carnem filii hominis, & sanguinem biberitis, non habetis vitam in vobis : facinus, vel flagitium videtur jubere. Figurata est ergo precipiens passioni Domini esse Communicandum, & suaviter, atque utiliter recondendum in memoriâ, quod pro nobis Caro ejus crucifixa, & vulnerata sit. Farthermore, This absurd unnatural sense, in which your Church takes the Words in their literal signification, implys many Blasphemies against the Dignity of our Lord's Body and Blood, as that his Body may be carried away with a puff of Wind, or by any Vermin that may eat it, that it may be vomited up by the Priest, that it may grow mouldy, that his Body and Blood may be poisoned, that his Blood may be turned into Vinegar, or congealed into Ice, or make the Receiver vomit by Emetick Mixtures, and the like. All this your Church supposes in her Missal *de defectibus in celebratione Missarum occurrentibus*; and you have obliged me to put you in remembrance of them, and make this Digression, about using Words in their properest sense.

IV. BUT to return: You say you do not remember to have read any where, that Church is taken for the || Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Church. But if you do not remember to have read it so taken any where, I do in a Writer cited in the Margin, whom perhaps you do

|| Nestarius Patriarcha Hierosol. p. 216. *Ad illud autem Gbrysoftomi dicentis, Hom. 4. in Isai 6. Facilius Sol extinguetur, quàm ut Ecclesia obscuretur, intelligitur de Catholica Ecclesia, aut per Synecdochen de fide ; pro causa causatum.*

not

not know, and in another whom you know and have a good Opinion of, I mean your self, who take the Protestant Church for *the Religion*, i. e. for the Faith, Worship, and Polity thereof, in your fourth Paragraph: *What reason, say you, had I to make a question of it, whether he would say the Protestant Church was the true one or no: — and I do not conceive why he should be so angry with me for not taking him to be such a Knave, as to be of a Religion, [i. e. of a Church,] which he would not say was the true one.* The like you do in your ninth Paragraph, where after these Words, *Who teach their Church is nothing but ours reformed*, you add in the next Period, *But I hope to prove to you, that if their Religion were true, &c.* In both these places, you take the Protestant Church of *England* for its Religion, i. e. for its Faith, Worship, and Polity, wherein it is reformed from yours: And indeed, such is the Alliance betwixt a Church and its Religion, that it is almost impossible to discourse of the former, without sometimes taking it for the latter; or to discourse of the latter, without sometimes taking it for the former; and the one is as proper a Metonymy as the other. We commonly say, the Church of the *Jews* is in the Old Testament, and the Christian Church is in the New; and should I tell you, I was going to the *Abyssine Ethiopia* to see the Church there, you would not think I went to see the Men, but to see and learn the Religion of that Church. Before I go on, Sir, perhaps you may expect I should give you thanks for your courtes Complement, in saying, *You do not take me to be such a Knave, as to be of a Religion which I would not say was the true one.* Indeed, Sir, I heartily thank you for it,

and frankly confess, I should be a great Knave to profess the Religion of the Church of *England*, and not believe it to be true. I believe it to be as true, as I believe yours to be false: To use *Tertullian's* Phrase, I believe it to be the Religion that the Church had from the Apostles, the Apostle's from Christ, and Christ from God. I believe the Church of *England* to be an Apostolical Church, *ob Consanguinitatem Doctrinae*; and in the sincerity of this Belief, I could by God's assistance suffer Martyrdom for it, and in the Apostle's passive sense of Resistance resist *Papery* unto Blood: For nothing less than such a sincere Persuasion of the Truth and Worth of our Religion, could oblige me in a croud of other Business to undertake the defence of it against such a sophistical Adversary as you, who employs me [to the great loss of my time,] almost in nothing, but in solving Fallacies and untwisting little Snares.

V. THE conclusion of your sixth Paragraph is admittable, and I should injure you if I did omit it: *Thus you may guess, Sir, (say you) that it is a harder thing to bring this Gentleman to the Bar, and make him speak out plainly Guilty or not Guilty, than perchance it would be to convict him, after he had once made his Plea.* Sir, this is a noble Metaphor, and it looks great in you to arraign me, and make me hold up my Hand at your Bar. But to leave you to reflect upon the incongruity of Pleading to an Indictment, and giving an Answer to a Query, pray what would you have me to have answer'd or pleaded to? *You desired to know, (if the Protestant Church was the true one) where it was many hundred Years before Luther?* I shew'd you the ambiguity and multiplicity

tiplicity of this Query; and according to the * Rules of Logick and Controversy, cited in the Margin, in order to make a plain Answer, I desired to know, first, which of the many Protestant Churches you meant, that I might tell you, if it was the true one? And, secondly, I desired to know, whether you meant the Clergy and People of that Protestant Church, or the Faith, Worship, and Polity of it? And I told you as plainly as I could speak, that if you meant the latter, I would tell you, *where the Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Church of England was many hundred Years before Luther, even where the present Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Roman Church never was, i. e. in the Primitive Church.* One would think this was a plain Answer, or in your Metaphor a direct Plea. But it was your Art to make your Disciples believe it was no Answer. Nay, that I was as unwilling to make an Answer to your Query, as a Thief to plead to an Indictment at the Bar; but tho' they, I believe, are, yet *we are not ignorant of your Devices.* If they were not hindred by Ignorance or Prejudice, they might have perceived, that my *No-Answer* was of such force, as to make you declare *you meant the Protestant Church of England,* and that by Protestants you meant *Christians* professing our Religion many hundred Years before Luther or the Reformation; and yet they did not discern my Answer to be an Answer, though I named who and where those Christians were that professed our Religion, even *the Primitive Christians in the best and*

* Such as these: *Aquivaca ante factam distinctionem, nec definiri possunt, nec sub scientiam cadere. Ambiguum omne prius est distinguendum, quam definiendum, aut alio quovis modo tractandum. Indistinctio parit continuas lites, nec aliter, quam distinguendo constabit, quid, aut de quo agitur.*

purest Ages of the Church. If you had spoken as plain in your Query, as I have forced you to speak in your Reply, you had had this close Answer proved as plainly and largely, as I hope I have proved it above. This you knew very well, and therefore you would not put your Query in plain Terms of certain Sense and Signification, according to the fore-mentioned Canons of Controversy: Wherefore it was you, Sir, who would not, who durst not speak out plainly, lest you should have a clear, close, and full Answer, which you were afraid of, and had no mind to receive; and you and her Brother daily pushing on your Profelyte, made her believe, that my Answer to your ambiguous Query, in which I desired you to explain your Terms and Meaning in order to a full Reply, was mere Tergiversation, and proceeded from unwillingness to *plead guilty*, by owning my self baffled, and so the *Day was your own*; and that, as you suggested, being all I could say, it was then high time for her *to be reconciled*.

C H A P. VII.

YOU write with the same Arrogance and Contempt of me in your IXth Paragraph: *Thus forsooth, was it necessary to dispute like Grammarians* (you should have said Logicians) *concerning the meaning of clear Words.* But did not I shew you they were Words and Expressions of uncertain Signification? And did not the known Canons of Controversy which I have cited above, require that in the Dispute between us we should come to a certainty of the Sense of all
your

your ambiguous Terms and Expressions; and that till the sense of them was adjusted, it was impossible for me to give an Answer to your Query. Then it follows: *But because it is so difficult a thing to draw him to a direct Answer, I will endeavour to gather one from his Words, which are conformable to those of the other Doctors of his Church, who teach that their Church is nothing but ours reformed: which this Gentleman explains by the Comparisons of a dirty Face washed, a muddy River cleansed, and a sick Man heal'd.* Sir, the direct Answer which you give for me, is very true, and I admit it, tho' in process of Controversy I was not come to it. You say you gather it from my Words, and so you might have gathered many more direct Answers from them, if you had pleased, as that no *Congregation of Christians professed your Religion in the primitive Church.* And as for my Similitudes, from which you gather it, they were used by me to shew how absurd and unreasonable, as well as sophistical your Challenge was in these Words: *Name your Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay, one single Congregation or Village of Protestants for 900 or 1000 Years before your Separation from the Holy Catholick Church.* After I had put you in mind how you begged the grand Question between us, I told you, you might as well have bid me name our Protestant Kings and Courts before Edward VI. or have asked a Sloven where his clean Face was for so many Days before it was washed? Or a sick Man, where his healthful Constitution was all the while he laid sick? Or a Man, who with great Cost and Labour had cleansed a River, which for many Ages had been muddy, where the pure and clean Stream of it was all the time it ran so foul? I used these

easy familiar Comparisons and Illustrations for the sake of your Convert, to let her see [if she would have seen] the fallacy of your Challenge; and to that end told you, that if it had been fairly panned, it should have been put in these or the like Words: *Name any Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay, one single Congregation or Village of Christians, that professed your Religion for 900 or 1000 Years before your Separation from the Church of Rome;* adding, that if you would put it so, I would give you an Answer, and then desire you to name one Church, Bishop, or Writer, nay, one single Congregation or Village of Christians, that 900 or 1000 Years ago professed the Tridentine Faith. This Detection of your fallacy forced you to say, you meant Christians professing our Religion, and had you said so at first, you had had the direct Answer I have given you in this Paper; and I pray you to take Notice again, that I challenge you to *name any Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay, one single Congregation or Village of Christians, that professed your Religion for a Thousand Years and upwards before the Council of Trent.* I have answered your Challenge plainly, and I expect you should answer mine; your own Honour, and the Honour of your Religion, the Honour of the Council of Trent, the Honour of Pope Pius IV's Creed, in 'a Word, your present Church requires you should answer it if you can; and if you do not, I shall take it for granted, you are conscious to your self that you cannot answer it. But to go on with the direct Answer, which you say you have gathered out of my Words, I hope, say you, to *prove to you that if their Religion were true, our Religion would have been none at all, and consequently incapable of being reformed, from which I will draw other*

con-

consequences of great Importance, and this as briefly as may be, not to be tedious. Before one comes to your important Consequences, one would think by your Words, that your Church before the Reformation had solemnly deny'd Jesus Christ, wilfully abandoned the whole ancient Apostolick Faith, and not only corrupted the pure Christian Religion [with adulterous Additions] but maliciously renounced it and apostatized from it, and so was become not a corrupt Church but no Church at all. Pray, Sir, tell me, is there no difference between a Christian, that is corrupt in his Faith and Worship, and a spiteful Apostate from Christianity that renounces Jesus Christ? Such an Apostate from Christianity to Judaism, Paganism, Mahumetanism, or Atheism, ceases in my Opinion to be a Christian, by such a wilful malicious Apostacy; and is thereby made incapable of being renewed again, as many learned Men think, who ground their Opinion on *Heb. ch. vi. 4, 5, 6. and x. 26, 27, 28, 29.* Or if he may be renewed, it ought to be by extraordinary Methods of Discipline or Renovation, very different from those by which Lapsers in Time of Persecution or in Prospect thereof fell away; or by which an uncatholick, erroneous, and corrupt Christian is to be restor'd upon Repentance to the Communion of the Catholick Church. Sir, I have premised this Parallel or Comparison betwixt a Church and a single Christian, because I think it just, and shall have Occasion to make use of it, though I fear you will be as angry at it, when you see the tendency of it, as you were at my Distinctions in my first Answer. And a *Religious Order*, being a Society, as the Church is, I must also put you in mind of the likeness betwixt a corrupt Religious Order and a corrupt Church. I did it partly

ly above, in the Comparifon betwixt an Unreformed Monk of *Citeaux*, and a Father of the Reformed Order at *la Trappe*. I am a little fond of this Comparifon, becaufe a Gentleman of my Acquaintance, who went to fee the Reformed Abbey there, was asked by one of the Fathers this Queftion, in Terms to this Effect: Sir, *I perceive you are an Englifh Gentleman, and if the Church of England be a true Church, I defire you to tell me where it was before Luther?* Father, replied the ingenious Gentleman, fuffer me to ask you a Queftion before I anfwer yours: You are a Monk of *la Trappe*, and if the Order here at *la Trappe* be the true Ciftercian Order, I defire you to tell me where it was before the late Reformation of Abbot de Rancé? The Father perceiving his Queftion about the Church of England, was answered by the Gentleman's Queftion of the fame Nature about the Reformed Order of *la Trappe*, let fall the Difcourfe about Religion, and proceeded to talk of other Things. But to return to my Comparifon of a corrupt Church with a corrupt Religious Order, let us fuppofe that a Father of the corrupt *Ciftercian Order*, much depraved from its firft Reform or Institution in the Year 1094, fhould fay to a Father of *la Trappe*, *You and your Fathers here teach, that your Order is nothing but ours reformed; but I hope to prove, that if your Order were true when you reformed, ours would have been none at all, and confequently incapable of being reformed.* I cannot but think, Sir, that if you were Moderator in fuch a Difpute, you would have interpoled here, and asked the Unreformed Monk, if he thought the *Ciftercians*, and particularly thofe of *la Trappe*, had renounced their Vow, and reneged their Order, and turned Seculars, before the pretended

tended Reformation in 1662. You would have asked him, I fancy, if there was no Difference between breaking and renouncing their solemn Vows, or corrupting and revolting from their Order, or between not living according to their first Rules, and utterly abandoning of them and turning Seculars? Or between a dissolute Monk or Order, and no Monk or Order at all? Pray, Sir, reflect a while on the parallel Cases of a Church and a Religious Order; and then tell me, if there is no Difference between a corrupt Christian (be he Heretick, Schismatick, or both) and a *renegade*, or no Christian; or between a corrupt Christian Church, be it Heretical, Idolatrous, or Schismatical, or all together, and no Church or a Church Apostate from all Christianity; or between a Religion, that holds the irresistable Truths of Christianity with pernicious Errors, and no Christianity at all. Stop a little here to reflect, and then go along with me to take a review of your *Proofs and Consequences* OF GREAT IMPORTANCE in Order as they lye.

II. I BEGIN with your Proofs. First then (say you in your Tenth Paragraph) *It is essential to a true Church of Christ not to teach and practice Idolatry. But the Roman Catholick Church according to their Principles, teaches and practices Idolatry.* Sir, you have been often told the Difference between metaphysical and moral Truth, or between a Church metaphysically and morally True; a Church *morally True*, signifying a right, sound, Orthodox Church, pure in Doctrine and Worship; but a Church *metaphysically true*, signifying no more than a Church, which is true in verity of Essence or a *real Church*. You see, Sir, I am distinguishing again, and I doubt you'll be still angry at my Distinctions; but for all that I must

I must not only distinguish, but apply my Distinction, and tell you that it is essential to a morally true Church of Christ, *i. e.* to a sound, right, orthodox Church, pure in Doctrine and Worship, not to teach and practice Idolatry, even as essential or necessary, as it is to be a sound Man not to have the Leprosy or Plague: But to a Church only true in a metaphysical Sense, *i. e.* to a *real* Church, it is not essential or necessary not to teach and practice Idolatry, no more than it is to a real Man not to have the Leprosy or Plague. This Difference between a barely real, and a right, sound, and pure Church, is the ground of another Distinction, which Writers use when they tell us, that the Word Church is taken properly and strictly or improperly and loosely; *properly and strictly taken*, it signifies the truly Catholick Church, ἐκκλησία ἐκλεκτή, &c. the elect Church, the holy Congregation, the Synagogue of Saints, as St. Ignatius calls it, otherwise the *Cæus fidelium seu Catholicorum*, the Church of truly Catholick and faithful Believers only: But *improperly and loosely taken* it is used to signify the Christian Church of Believers in common, orthodox or heterodox, sound or corrupt, as they are distinguished from Infidels, that do not believe in Christ, as from *Jews* and *Greeks* of old, and now from *Mahumetans*, according to that of † *Critopulus*, ἐκκλησία ἐστὶν ὡς μὴ τὶς βέβαιον, &c. The Church, as some speak, is the Congregation of all those, who believe the Preaching (or Doctrine) of the Gospel in any manner, I mean the Orthodox Believers and Hereticks. [So *Nestarius*, as cited in my Answer to your Query, *Quam autem Ecclesia sumitur spiritua-*

† In Confess. fid. cap. 7.

liter,

liter, &c. When the Word Church is taken in a spiritual Sense, it signifies a lawful, or unlawful Church; such as those are, who are called in the *Canons* irregular Churches and Schisms; of which the *Psalmist*, *Odio habui Cetus malignantium.* And according to this Acceptation of the Word Church in common, for orthodox or heterodox Churches, I believe you will not easily deny, but that an heretical, schismatical, or idolatrous Church, notwithstanding its Heresy, Schism, or Idolatry, may in verity of Essence be a real, tho' not a right, sound, and pure Church. I say *may be*, because some Heresies and Idolatries may be of such a Nature, as to amount to Apostacy or Renegation of God or Christ, as some do not. But how culpable the Churches of God have been by Heresies, Schisms, and Idolatries of the latter Sort, and yet own'd by him for his Churches, is evident from the Scriptures of both Testaments. In the Old Testament we read, that the Church of God was corrupt to that degree by Idolatry, as well as other Sins, that he threatned to treat them without Mercy, as if they were not his People. The Prophet *Hosea* signified the former to them by the Prophetical Symbol of taking a Wife of Whoredoms, by which they were to understand their own idolatrous Whoredoms, and the latter by the Names of her Daughter and Son, *Lo Rubamah* and *Lo-Amimi*. Not to recite their other Sins, as want of Truth, Mercy, and Knowledge of God, Lying, Perjury, Bloodshed, Adultery, and Schism; but to insist upon their Idolatry, as set forth by that Prophet; the Church of *Israel* was not the Spouse of God, *i. e.* his faithful Spouse, nor he her Husband, *i. e.* no longer her loving Husband, because she committed spi-
ritual

tual † Whoredom, and play'd * the Harlot, in asking Counsel of Stocks, and sacrificing upon Mountains, and burning Incense under Oaks and Elms. The Spirit of Whoredom was so in the midst of them, that they knew not the Lord. All *Israel* was defiled. His Wrath was kindled against them for the Calf of *Samaria*, and therefore he did not accept of their Sacrifices. They made them goodly Images, the Calves of *Beth-aven*, but he threatened to spoil them; and yet notwithstanding their Backsliding and Rebellions, all this while they were his People, his *Peculium*, his Church, which he sent his Prophets to *hew*, that is, to reform them, when they had sinned more and more, and made molten Images of Silver, and Idols according to their Understanding, of which they said, *Let the Men that sacrifice, kiss the Calves; and yet,* saith he, *I am the Lord thy God from the Land of Egypt, and thou shalt know no God but me, for there is no Saviour beside me.* And as their God, he spoke to them by Prophets, and multiplied Visions upon Visions, and used Similitudes after Similitudes, *as that of the Wife of Whoredoms and her Children*, by the Ministry of his Prophets, that they might repent, and that he might heal them, and not send them into Captivity. And all the while they were in Captivity in the State and Condition of *Lo-Ammi*, without Prince, or Prophet, or Temple, or Altar, or Sacrifice, or Incense, or Priestly Ministration, yet they pray'd unto him as his People, and he heard their Prayers, and took care of them as his *Peculium*; and upon their Repentance, brought them out of Captivity,

† *Cypriani ad Quirinum Lib. i.* * *Hosea. ii. 5. iv. 15.*

almost

almost in as miraculous a manner, as he brought their Fathers out of *Ægypt*, and made them a glorious Church again. The like might be said of the Church of *Judab*; the faithful City became an Harlot: *Judab* play'd the Harlot upon every high Hill, and under every green Tree; [and if you would have more, I refer you for the Idolatrous State of that Church to the Twenty Third Chapter of the 2d of *Kings*, from the First to the Sixteenth Verse:] Wherefore, if not to practice any Idolatry be essential to the Being of a Church or to a real Church, then both the Church of *Jerusalem* and *Israel* divers times lost their Being, and God, (as to human Sight) had no Church amongst the *Jews*. Some Idolatries indeed may destroy the Being of a Church, as if the Church of the *Jews* had wilfully and maliciously denied or reneged the God of their Fathers, who brought them out of the Land of *Ægypt*, for another false God, and absolutely renounced their Covenant with him, and apostatiz'd from the Law, and turn'd *Gentiles*, as much as if they had never been *Jews*. But their Idolatry, tho' very abominable, was not of that heinous Church-destroying Nature, because in their Idolatry they still owned and worshipped God, tho' in an idolatrous manner: *Thou hast polluted the Land with thy Whoredoms, thou hast play'd the Harlot with many Lovers, but return again to me, saith the Lord*: Nay, when they worshipped *Baal*, they worshipped God also. Their Crime was not wholly leaving God for *Baal*, but worshipping *Baal* as well as God. And the like they did, when they worshipped *Moloch* as well as the Lord, as it is written, *Ye have offer'd me Sacrifices and Offerings in the Wilderness Forty Years; O House of Israel, but you*

you have born the Tabernacle of your + Moloch and Chiun, your Images the Star of your God, which you made for your selves; therefore I will cause you to go into Captivity, saith the Lord, whose Name is the God of Hosts. So Solomon went not fully after the Lord, as did his Father David, but built an high Place for *Chemosh*, the Abomination of *Moab*, the Abomination of the Children of *Ammon*; but tho' he went after other Gods, yet did he not renounce the God of *Israel*, but his Heart was said to be turned from the Lord, because he broke the First Commandment, in having other Gods besides him: Had he been faithful to the Lord, had he loved him with all his Heart, and Soul, and Strength, he had not gone after other Gods. And so for the People and Church of *Israel*, even in the Reign of *Ahab*, it was not their Fault, as I said before, that they apostatized from the Lord to *Baal*, revolting utterly to the false from the true God; but that they worshipped *Baal* sometimes as well as him, which was called forsaking of God, halting between two Opinions, and following God and *Baal* by turns, because they went not fully after him, nor loved him the true and jealous God with all their Heart, and Soul, and Strength, but served him and *Baal* too. But notwithstanding all this time, because they did not utterly and maliciously forsake him, they remained his *real*, tho' not his faithful Church; and as they never forsook, or renounced, or disowned him wholly, so he never wholly forsook, or renounced, or disowned

1st Acts vii. 43. *Ye took up the Tabernacle of Moloch, and the Star of your God Remphan, Figures which ye made to worship them; and I will carry you away beyond Babylon.*

them,

them, for his Great Name's sake. They often forgot the Lord their God, as when they served *Baalim* and *Astaroth*; but yet when they cried unto the Lord, he delivered them. This he still did upon their Repentance, till they crucified the Messias, and resisted the Miracles of the Holy Ghost and the Preaching of the Apostles, who turned from them unto the Gentiles. So in your Church, you worship the only true God, but you make Invocations to departed Saints for the same Blessings, and in the same Words of Invocation that you pray for unto him; and you pray unto them in Postures of Worship before their Images and consecrated Statues set over Altars, as the Heathens did before the Images of their *Dii Medioximi*, or Mediatory Deities. You also worship Christ before the Image of his Human Nature; nay, [as you believe the Host or consecrated Wafer to be Christ,] so you Worship it as him, tho' it is impossible it should be him; and the Doctrine upon which you ground that Worship, implies as many Contradictions and Indignities against his Honour, as any other the Wit of Man can invent. [One of your † Popes blasphemously calls it, *The Creator of Heaven and Earth*; and so indeed it must be, if, as the Council of Trent hath defined, the holy *Eucharist* is truly, really, and substantially, the Body and Blood with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that he is all and whole under one Kind only. If, saith that Pope, *there is any thing plainly Divine among Men, for which the Saints above, if they were subject to Envy, would envy us below, it*

† Urban VIII. before the *Missal*. *Si quid est in rebus humanis plane divinum, &c.*

L

certainly

certainly is the most holy Sacrifice of the Mass, by the benefit of which it comes to pass, that Men by a kind of Anticipation † enjoy Heaven in Earth, whilst they do not only see with their Eyes, but handle with their Hands the Creator of Heaven and Earth.]

III. You also Worship the material Cross, as I have already proved; and nothing can excuse you, much less justify you from Idolatrous Worship in these Instances, but such like Apologies as the Philosophers framed to justify the Pagan Idolatries; and what hath usually been said in defence of your Idolatrous Worship, will go a great way to justify theirs. All this, Sir, is as true as your Conclusion is false, that if you are guilty of Idolatry in these Instances, as we not only affirm, but prove, that *therefore the Roman Catholick Church is no true (i. e. no real) Church of Christ, nor was it when we left it.* I have already shewed the Difference between a true Church in a metaphysical and in a moral Sense; and told you before, that when I came to this part of your Reply, I would use *real*, where you use *true* Church, to discover the Fallacy of your Argument, and how you imposed upon your Convert, by the ambiguity of that Expression. And pray, Sir, let me ask of the single or personal Members of your Church or any part of it, upon *Supposition* that you are guilty of that Idolatry we charge you with: Do they therefore cease to be Christians, as well as sound and orthodox Christians? Are they no more Christians, than if they had maliciously renounced Christianity? Are they become profess'd Infidels of any Sort, *Jews*, or *Turks*, or *Pagans*, or *Atheists*, or *Deists*, by being Mem-

† *Possident.*

bers

bers of a Christian Church corrupted with Idolatry ; and if they are *true*, that is, *real* Christians, notwithstanding their Idolatrous Belief and Practices, [as most certainly they are,] how comes the whole Church, which is made up of those single Members, to lose her Being, and become no Church by the same Idolatry ? As they are real Christians guilty of Idolatry, so is she a real Church guilty of Idolatry : And, as if they would forsake Idolatry and other Errors of your Church, they would thereby commence sound and true, as well as real Christians ; so would she reform from Idolatry and her other Errors and Corruptions, she would thereby become a Church morally, as well as metaphysically true, *i. e.* [*Cætus* or *Congregatio Catholicorum*,] a holy, pure, sound, orthodox, as well as a real Church. [To confirm what I say, I entreat you to consult *Canon. Apost. lxxii. Canon. Concil. Nicen. xi, xii, xiii, xiv.* and the first nine Canons of the Council of *Ancyra*, which was before the Council of *Nice*. From these Canons it is evident, that Christians who denied God and Christ, and sacrificed to Idols, and eat of the Meats which were offered to them in the *Decian, Licinian, and Dioclesian* Persecutions, and by Consequence were declared Idolaters ; yet were not thought by their Fall to have fallen from Christianity, or become Gentiles, or cease thereby to be Christians. Nay, the Clergymen who denied and sacrificed, were not thought thereby to fall from their *Clergy* or Orders, or cease to be Bishops, Priests, or Deacons, though in some Cases they were thought worthy to be degraded or reduced to Lay-Communion, and in others, keeping their Rank and Dignity, they were only silenced, and forbidden to execute their Functions ; which shews in the Judgment of those early and pure

Ages, that the Sin of Idolatry did neither destroy the Being of a Christian as such, nor deface the Character nor null the Orders of a Priest. If that had been the effect of it, they could not have been reconciled or restored to the Church, according to those Canons and the Practice of the *African Church* in the *Decian Persecution*, as may be seen in the Synodical Epistle of the *African Bishops* to *Cornelius*, which is the LVII. in the *Oxford Edition* of *St. Cyprian*, and in that Father's Tract *De lapsis*, where you will find, that Lapsers into Idolatry were reconciled by degrees of Penitence proportioned to the degrees of their Crimes. The same was the Practice of the Church of *Rome* under *Cornelius*, as appears from *Eusebius's Eccl. History, lib. vi. cap. xliii.* particularly from the Story of *Trophimus* a Bishop, whom, though he had offered Incense to Idols in the Persecution, that Pope admitted to Lay-Communion. I must also entreat you to consult *St. Hierom's Dialogue* against the *Luciferians*; where he proves the † *Arian* Priests and Bishops to have been true, that is, real and valid Priests and Bishops, and the *Arian* Churches to have been true, i. e. real Christian Churches against *Lucifer* of *Calaris* and his Followers, * who looked upon them as no Christians, but as Gentiles; and their Bishops,

not

† Ita etiam tempore Arianae hareseos, quicumque cum Arianis communicaverant, aut in Arianum dogma lapsi fuerant, non solum suscepta sunt in Communionem, sed etiam Episcopatus retinuerunt. Ac contraria Luciferi Calaritani, severitas improbata est. Du Pin de Antiquæ Ecclesiæ Disciplinâ. Dissert. iii. cap. ii.

* Orthodox. dixit, Omnes ergo hæretici Christiani non sunt. Lucif. Jam superius audisti. Orthod. Si Christiani non sunt, Diaboli sunt. Lucif. Nemo dubitat. Orthod. Si autem Diaboli sunt, nihil refert hæretici, an Gentiles. Lucif. Non refello. Orthod.

not as Bishops, but as Heathen Priests; and their Churches, not as Christian Churches, but rather as Synagogues of Antichrist and Satan, like the Capitol, which ought not to be called Churches. That Dialogue and St. *Hierom's* way of arguing in it, is wholly contrary to yours, and tho' I will not charge the Heresy of *Lucifer* upon you, yet I affirm it is the Consequence of your Arguments; and I pray you to consider of it, and tell me, if you think] the * corrupt Church of *Pergamus* ceased to be a Church or lost her Being, by having those among them, who not only held [and taught] the Doctrine of the *Nicolaitans*, but the idolatrous Doctrine of *Balaam*, who taught the Children of *Israel* to eat things sacrificed to Idols, and commit Fornication, and put *Antipas*, Christ's faithful Martyr, to Death, because he bore his Testimony against them. Did

Orthod. *Igitur prae fixum inter nos habemus de haeretico sic loquendum sicut de Gentili. Lucif. Planè fixum. Orthod. Quare nunc, ut libet, quoniam inter nos constat haereticos Gentiles esse. Lucif. Quod interrogatio mea cogere volebat, expressum est haereticos Christianos non esse. Nunc restat conclusio. Si Ariani haeretici sunt, & haeretici omnes Gentiles sunt, & Ariani Gentiles sunt. Si autem Ariani Gentiles sunt, tum constat nullam societatem Ecclesiae esse cum Arianis, id est, cum Gentilibus: manifestum est vestram Ecclesiam, qua ab Arianis, id est, à Gentilibus Episcopos suscipis, non tam Episcopos recipere, quam de Capitolio Sacerdotes, ac per hoc Anti-Christi magis Synagoga, quam Christi Ecclesia debet nuncupari. Orthod. Ecce impleta est prophetia: paravit mihi foveam, & ipse incidit in eam. Lucif. Quoniam modo? Orthod. Si Ariani, ut dicis Gentiles sunt, & Arianorum conventicula castra sunt Diaboli, quomodo in castris Diaboli Baptismum recipis.*

* *Angelo Ephesi deserta charitas imputatur. In Angelo Pergamena Ecclesia Idolothytorum esus, & Nicolaitorum doctrina reprehenditur. Item apud Angelum Thiatyrorum Hicelabel Prophetissae simulacrorum esca, & fornicationes increpantur. Et tamen omnia hoc ad poenitentiam Dominus hortatur, sub comminatione futurae poenae nisi convertantur. Hieronymus adversus Luciferianos.*

the Church of *Thyatira* cease to be a real, as well as a pure Church, because she let the Woman *Jesabel* teach and seduce her Servants to commit Fornication, and to eat Things sacrificed to Idols ; which provoked God to threaten to cast her into a Bed of Sorrow, and them who committed spiritual Adultery with her into great Tribulation, unless they repented of their Deeds ? So he threatned the Church of *Pergamus* to fight against her with the Sword of his Mouth, unless she repented. Repentance, if real, would have made them pure and morally holy Churches ; and so Repentance and Reformation would make yours. But if she will not remember from whence she is fallen, and repent, if she will not reform from her spiritual Fornications, and do her first Works, God will come upon her as a Thief, and she shall not know in what Hour he will come upon her. He shall call her to account, when she doth not think of it, and make her pay the long, long Reckoning of his infinite Patience. The Churches shall then know, that he is the searcher of the Reins and Hearts, and will give to every one of them according to their Works. He can call for the Whirle-wind and spoilers from the *North*, to avenge his Cause upon her. For three Transgressions of *Tyrus*, and for four, he will not turn away the Punishment thereof ; he can, he will find a way to make her and her Shepherds lament and howl : And tho' she flatters her self with the Promise of Perpetuity, and saith in her Heart, I shall never be moved, usurping the Stile of the one holy Catholick and Apostolick Church ; yet he can do unto her as unto the *Midianites*, as to *Sisera*, as to *Jabin*, as to the Princes of *Zeba* and *Salmanna*, and make her as the Dung of

of the Earth. He can * call for another *Alarick*, not only to sack, but utterly to destroy her; he can make another *Lewis* Stamp upon his Coins, *Perdam Nomen Babylonis*, and another after him fulfil the Inscription. The Kings of the Earth, whom she hath made drunk with the Cup of her Enchantment, he can cause to hate the Whores, and make her desolate and naked, and eat her Flesh, and burn her with Fire. Do you think, Sir, that the four once great and glorious Oriental Churches of *Jerusalem*, *Antioch*, *Alexandria* and *Constantinople*, which you now despise, were Sinners above all other Churches? I tell you, nay, but except your Church; your Church, which exalts her Throne above the Stars of God; your Church, which takes upon her to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; your Church, which still thinks she sits as Queen; unless *she* repent and reform, she shall be brought into their Condition, if not finally perish. I am no Prophet nor a Prophet's Son, but take upon me to foretel, that if she will still ascend above the height of the Clouds, and be as *Lucifer*, like the most High, she shall be brought down as low as Hell. God can make the *Horsemen of Euphrates* trample upon her, as well as upon the Oriental Churches; he can pull down the Cross from the Dome of *San Pietro*, and plant the Crescent in its Place. Something he will do, to something he will call to destroy her; he will hiss for the Flie, and send for the Horner, unless she repents and amends. May she rather prevent her Ruin by her Reformation. May God of his Mercy to the Christian

* *Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. x.* Οὐκ ἐστὶν ἔτι ἐθνον-
της ὅτι τὰ ἑαυτοῦ πορεύομαι· ἀλλὰ τις καθ' ἑκαστὴν ὄχλῳ
μοι βασιανίζων, καὶ λείπον· ἀπιθεῖ δὲ Ῥωμαίων πορεύεται
πάλιν.

World send a double, a *decuple* Portion of *Marcellus* the Second's reforming Spirit upon his Successors, and fill the *Conclave* as he did the House, where the Apostles met on the Day of *Pentecost*, with the Holy Spirit, that *Rome* may again become a holy Catholick and Apostolick Church indeed, and all the Churches of her Communion be at last delivered from the Bondage of Corruption into the glorious Liberty of the Children of God.

C H A P. VIII.

BUT I must hasten to your second Proof of this Consequence, that if our Religion were true, yours would have been none at all. It is in your Eleventh Paragraph as follows: 2dly, *I prove it out of the foresaid 19th Article of their own Church thus; The visible Church of Christ is a Congregation of faithful Men, in which the Sacraments be duly administred according to Christ's Ordinance: But in the Roman Catholick Church, according to their Doctrine, the Sacraments are not duly administred: Therefore the Roman Catholick Church is not (was not when they left it) the visible (nor a visible) Church of Christ.* Sir, I grant both your Premises and your Conclusion from this Definition of the Church. For the Church of *Rome* is neither the visible nor a visible Church of faithful Men, in which the Sacraments are duly administred according to Christ's Ordinance, but a Church of unfaithful Men, in which the Sacraments are not duly administred according to Christ's Ordinance; and therefore she is neither the visible nor a visible Church. I grant you more than you require,
for

for I do not allow that you administer Baptism duly ; and yet, tho' you administer both Sacraments corruptly, but the one much more corruptly than the other, doth it follow from thence, that you are no Church at all, because in the Scholastical or Theological sense of the Word *Visible*, [for the *Cætus fidelium*,] you are neither the, nor a visible Church? Indeed, in the *civil* or vulgar Signification of the Word, you are a *visible corrupt* Church, or, if you please, a Church most *visibly corrupted* in Doctrine, Worship, and Polity ; for which Reason, you can neither be the visible, nor a visible Church, in the Theological Sense of the Word, in which it is [restrained to signify] in general, the true holy Catholick Apostolick Church dispersed over the Earth, or particularly any part of it, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments duly administered according to Christ's Ordinance. But your Argument is formed upon the civil use of the Word in common Conversation, and not as it signifies in Controversy and in the Schools, and thus you pervert our unskilful People with Fallacies ; you jingle our straying Sheep from our safe to your pernicious Fold, from us and from the Truth, and from the Visible or Catholick Church of *England*, to your Uncatholick Church, with ambiguous sounds of Words, for which you must one Day give an Account to God. The Catholick Church of Christ or Universality of faithful Believers, came, as I observed before, to be called the *Visible* Church, because it ordinarily holdeth visible Assemblies, in which it useth external Worship and Sacraments, and maketh open Professions of the Apostolick Faith, and teacheth nothing as necessary to Salvation, that is dubious, false, or damnable. This visible Church
is

is not confined to place, nor to any number of Persons beyond so many, as may make a publick Assembly. And wherever it is, it is conspicuous and discernable by the lustre of its pure Doctrine, Worship, and Ministry (excepting some Seasons of Persecutions) and like a light set on a Hill, which cannot be hid, it shines wheresoever it appears in the Eyes of Jews, Gentiles and Hereticks, and thereby calls and invites them unto it; and all diligent Enquirers who come to any part of it, may easily discern it by the purity of its Doctrine, Worship, and Ministry, as by a light, that it is the true Catholick Church. Such a Church as this, greater or less, Christ will always have in some part of the World; and such a Church ours is, as it stands reformed from yours; which is a *true*, but not a good Church, *true* or real in verity of Essence, though no part of the *visible* Church, in this strict Theological Sense of the Schools.

II. YOUR third Proof in your twelfth Paragraph is of the same fallacious Sort, and therefore I need but transcribe it to confute it. *3dly, Out of the foresaid Article, the visible Church is a Congregation of faithful Men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, &c. But in the Roman Catholick Church, according to their Doctrine, the pure Word of God is not preached, therefore the Roman Catholick Church is not, nor was not when they went from it, the visible (or a visible) Church of Christ.* Sir, I grant the whole, for in its best and purest State, it never was the *visible Church*, but only a glorious part of it; but it is now many Hundred Years since it was a *visible Church* or a *Congregation of faithful Men*, &c. But because it is neither the visible nor a visible Church, neither the pure Catholick nor a pure Catholick Church, therefore

therefore is it no Church at all? Did it lose its Being with its Putity, or cease to be, when it ceased to be good? What think you of the corrupt idolatrous Churches of *Judea* and *Israel*, described above, and of *Pergamus* and *Thyatira*? Were they Churches, or were they not, when God taxed them with their Corruptions, and sent his Prophets by Word or Writing to reform them? What think you of the heretical idolatrous *Arian* Church spread over the face of the Empire, and diffused through the Oriental and Occidental Churches, when † almost all the Latin Churches turned Arians? Did their Heresy or Idolatry destroy their Being as Churches? Were they in a State of *Gentilism*? And did they become no Churches at all for denying the Divinity and eternal Generation of the Son, and worshipping what they believed to be but a meer Man? Or will you, dare you say they were incapable of being reformed, because they were no Churches, nor had any Christianity at all, because their Religion was corrupt? Will you allow this way of arguing against their Reformation, which you use here against ours? Will you stand to the same Consequences in both Cases? Pardon me, Sir, if I presume to say you will not, you dare not. You will not, because you cannot answer the Arguments of St. *Hierom* in his fore-cited Dialogue against the *Luciferians*; and you dare not, because you dare not oppose so great an Authority, and stand to the Consequence

† *Item quando Arianorum, venenum non jam portiunculam quandam, sed pene Orbem totum contaminaverat, adeo ut prope cunctis Latinis Sermonis Episcopis partim vi, partim fraude deceptis Caligo quadam mentis offunderetur, &c.* Vincent *Lirinensis* Common. Cap. vi. vid. *Fauftini Presbyteri libellum precum. Ingemuit totus Orbis, & Arianum se esse miratus est.* Hieronymus adversus *Luciferian*.

of

of your Argument against the Reformation of almost the whole Universal Church? If then you will not, you dare not stand to your own Argument and its Consequences, take a little Shame to your self and be humbled, as it were in Sackcloth and Ashes, for seducing half instructed People by such Sophistry or fallacious Reasoning, as affects your very *Mission*, and makes all your and your *Fellow-Missioners* endeavours to reconcile our Church void and to no purpose, and all your Labour vain. For according to your Doctrine, the Church of *England* is not a visible true Church, and therefore by your Argument it is no Church. It cannot be a real Church by your Logick, which, according to your Doctrine, is so corrupt in all the parts of its Constitution, and not *Cæus fidelium*, but *Cæus malignantium*, all Heresy and Schism. Consider then, Sir, and tell me, doth the Heresy, and Schism, and other Corruptions in Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline, which you impute to it, destroy its Being, because they destroy its Rectitude and Purity? If they do, why do you endeavour to reconcile us? Can you make a Church of no Church by my meer Reconciliation? That is impossible, because if your Arguments are true, a corrupt Church is no Church, and a corrupt Religion no Religion at all. You profess and believe *the Catholick Faith*, which the † Council of *Trent* confesses in the *Constantinopolitan Creed*, and acknowledges to be the very Doctrine, against which the Gates of Hell shall not prevail, and that really makes you to be a Christian Church, as to Doctrine, because you hold to the Foundation of Christianity; but because [you have determined many uncertain and other false

Doctrines and Tenets to be true, which you cannot prove, and anathematise the Opposers of them] and have added not only many uncertain and dubious, but false, and absurd, or impossible, yea impious and pernicious Doctrines to the old Creed, [not only to be assented to as conditions of Communion, but] as necessary to be taught and believed in order to Salvation: That makes you to be a most erroneous and corrupt Church, from which all the Christian World [in your Communion] ought to reform, because all that impure mixture with the Ancient, Catholick, Apostolical Faith, you call without any distinction †, *the true Catholick Faith out of which no Man can be saved*. In like manner, as to *Worship*, you have in your Offices some ancient, chaste, pure Invocations of the Holy Trinity, and some Prayers unto God in primitive Purity through Jesus Christ and his Merits, and this is Christian Worship; but then you have also Prayers [exceedingly corrupt, in some of which you ask Blessings of God by the Merits and Intercession of Saints *], without any mention of Christ, or his Merits, or Intercession, and in others,

† *Hanc veram Catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo Salvus esse potest. Bulla Pii IV. super formâ Juramenti professionis Fidei.*

* *Deus, qui de beata Maria Virginis utero verbum tuum, Angelo nuntiante, Carnem suscipere voluisti. Presta supplicibus tuis, ut qui verè eam Genetricem Dei credimus, ejus apud te intercessionibus adjuvemur. Dominica iii. adventus in Misale Rom.*

Hac nos communitio, Domine, purget a crimine, & intercedente beatâ Virgine, Dei Genetrice Mariâ, Cœlestis remedii facias esse Consortes. See many more of this kind in a discourse, intitled, *Speculum Beata Virginis*, London printed 1686.

which

which indeed you conclude *per Dominum*, * you blend their Intercessions and Merits with his, and so debase and pollute the Devotions, in which you use his holy and meritorious Name.] You have also direct Prayers and Intercessions to Saints, to whom you pray in postures of adoration before their || *consecrated* Images, and you pray to Christ before the Image of his humane Nature, [and as I have shew'd before, you worship the Cross] and you † adore the *Host* after Consecration, and elevate it to be adored by the People with divine Worship [and at certain times expose it ||| and carry it about for adoration] and these impure and idolatrous mixtures (which have long called for Reformation) with the purer parts of your Worship, pollute your [daily Sacrifices and] whole divine Service, and makes your Communion so corrupt, that all Christians are obliged to leave your Church, lest they partake of her Sins and Plagues. In like manner, as to the *Polity and Ministry* of the

*—*Gloriosa semper Virginis Maria—beatorum Apostolorum, ac Martyrum tuorum, & omnium Sanctorum, quorum meritis precibusque concedas, ut in omnibus protectionis tue muniamur auxilio, per eundem Christum dominum nostrum. Amen. In. Can. Missæ. See more such in Speculum Beata Virginis.*

|| Pontificale Romanum, pars 1. de benedictione, imag. B. Maria Virg. & aliorum Sanctorum.

† Prolatis verbis Consecrationis statim Consecratam genuflexus adorat, surgit, ostendit populo, In Can. Missæ. Tunc se erigens—elevat in altum Hostiam—populo reverenter ostendit adorandam. Celebrans, adorato Sacramento, surgit, & discooperit calicem—genuflexus Sanguinem reverenter adorat. Tum se erigit, & accipiens calicem discoopertum cum Sanguine, ambabus manibus, ut prius, elevat eum, & erectum ostendit populo adorandum. Ritus Servandus in Celebratione Missæ, viii.

■ *Concil. Trident. Sess. XIII. Cap. V. Can. VI.*

Church,

Church, you indeed retain the Primitive Apostolical Institution of Bishops, an Order distinct from and superiour to Presbyters; but then your Doctrine of the Roman Church's being the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; † the Oath of Fidelity and Subjection, which not only all Bishops, but all Archbishops or Metropolitans must take to the Pope at Consecration, before they receive the * Pall, by which in your Church the

† *Forma juramenti in Pontificali Romano de consecratione Electi in Episcopum* : Ego N. electus Ecclesie N. ab hac hora in antea fidelis, & obediens ero beato Petro Apostolo, &c.

* Of the Pall. One of your own Doctors, Du Pin, in his first Dissertation, *de Antiqua Ecclesia disciplina*, writes in this manner, §. XII. *Succedente vero tempore pontifices Romani ordinandorum per universum occidentem Episcoporum potestatem non sine multa contradictione sibi vindicavere, & omnium Metropolitanorum jura paulatim pessumdederunt. Primum quidem Metropolitica ordinationum jura ad se trahere conati sunt per Concessionem PALLII. Eo enim dabatur à pontificibus, ut possent plenam auctoritate sua provinciam Episcopos ordinare, unde sequebatur hanc potestatem à Pontifice Metropolitanis simul cum PALLIO concedi. Hinc postea novo jure Metropolitanis interdictum est, universis functionibus Episcopalibus, donec Pallium recipissent, juramentumque FIDEI introductum est. Secundò ad Pontificem Romanum devoluta sunt appellationes judiciorum, quæ à Metropolitanis late erant circa Controversias, quæ in electionibus occurrebant. Tertiò si Electores essent negligentes aut si hominem minime idoneum elegissent, devolvebatur electio ad Pontificem Romanum. Quartò Romano Episcopo reservatum est jus admittendi Cessiones Episcopatum, decernendique translationes, & coadjutorias cum futura Successione. Demum confirmatio Electionum omnium Episcoporum ipsi concessa. Quod jus Concordatis confirmatum est. Veruntamen ad duodecimum usque seculum facta testè jura sua conservaverunt in Gallia Metropolitani.* And how contrary all these Papal Encroachments are to the Liberty of Christ's Church, and the ancient Suburbicarian Jurisdiction of the Popes may be seen in the same Book of that great Man, XI, XII, XIII. of the same Dissertation.

* Plenitude

* Plenitude of the Episcopal Office, and the Powers of it are conferred; The Oath of Obedience, which all Ecclesiasticks regular and secular must also make to the Bishop of *Rome*, as Successor to *St. Peter*, the Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar-General of Jesus Christ: In a Word, the Doctrine of the Pope's Sovereignty, or being supreme Head of the Catholick Church, is so contrary to the ancient Principles of Church-Government, and the primitive Rights and Immunities of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and hath so enslaved the free Episcopate, and alter'd the face of it in your Church that it is no more like what it was and ought to be, then your Worship is like the pure primitive Worship, or your New like to the Old Creed. But then because you retain the ancient Creeds, and have in your Offices for Worship many choice and pure Prayers, and also retain the primitive Hierarchical Order and Ministry, by Bishops, Priests and Deacons, you are a real Church; but because you have added new and pernicious Doctrines to the pure old Creeds, impure to your pure Worship, and enslaved the whole Clergy, and particularly the Episcopal Order to the Pope, you are not morally a holy and true, or a Catholick, Aposto-

* *Tradimus tibi Pallium de Corpore Beati Petri sumptum in quo est Plenitudo Pontificalis Officii. Et quia Pontificalis Officii plenitudo confertur per Pallium, antequam obtinuerit quis Pallium, licet sit consecratus, non sortitur Nomen Patriarchæ Primatis, aut Archiepiscopi; & non licet in Episcopos consecrare, nec convocare ad Concilium; nec Chrisma consecrare; nec Ecclesias dedicare; nec Clericos ordinare; etiam si Pallium in aliâ Ecclesiâ habuisset, cum oporteat petere novum Pallium. Pontificale Romanum de Pallio. Non tamen deberet se Archiepiscopum appellare prius, quam à nobis Pallium suscepisset, in quo Pontificalis Officii plenitudo cum Archiepiscopalis nominis appellatione confertur. Decret. Gregor. Lib. i. Tit. viii. Cap. iii.*

lical,

lical, but in all the Parts of your Ecclesiastical Constitution a most corrupt uncatholick Church. Do but follow our Example and reform, do but set back your Church to what it was a thousand Years before the Council of *Trent*; and then of a *real* Church which you are, and for whose Reformation I daily pray, you will recommence a right and true Church.

III. F R O M your Proofs I pass to your *Consequences*, [which you say are of great Importance, but] which can be of no greater Importance than your Proofs; and therefore your Proofs being so plainly disproved, your Consequences from them can be of no Importance at all, though you introduce them with great shew to raise Expectation, in your Thirteenth Paragraph. *Thus*, say you, *have I proved, that according to their Principles the Roman Catholick Church was not a Church of Christ, when they pretended to reform it. To which I answer without any Thus, that you have tricked, and shamefully trifled and wasted your Ink and Paper, and proved nothing at all. But let us go on: It follows, first, that no Protestant Church could reform it, no more than one can wash a Face that hath no Being. But I have proved it had a Being, and having a Being it did reform it self, as a sloven may wash his own dirty Face. Then it follows; So that they are not a reformed Religion, but absolutely a New Religion, i.e. a false Religion; for it is evident, their Religion is new, if it was not reformed. But I have shewn that it is not a new, but a renewed and reformed Religion, which retains the pure, and rejected all the impure Additions which you still keep: What our Church hath now, it had before it reformed it self, though it hath not all that it had, because it had much more that it ought to have.*

M had

had. You know *the Church* is often taken synecdochically for the Clergy; and the Clergy of the *Church of England* reformed themselves, and the Doctrine, Worship, and Polity of their Church. They sifted the Popish Chaff from the Primitive Wheat, the Dross and baser Mixtures from the pure Metal. They retained that which while they were a corrupt Popish, made them a real Church; and by throwing off all the Popish Errors, Innovations, Abuses and Corruptions, they recommenced a true pure Catholick Church. To heal a Sore (* faith an ingenious Gentleman of our Church) to purge a sick and diseased Body, is not to make a new Body, but to renew it and restore it to its former Health. Let me give you but one familiar Example of your own in this latter Age: St. Francis established the Order of Franciscans; and they, according to the meaning of their first Founder, did for a long Time follow the Institution of their first Orders: Afterwards, when certain Errors and Corruptions had crept in among them, some separated themselves from the rest, and were called the Recollects. Upon this Occasion a Suit was commenced, to decide whether the Recollects or the other Franciscans did adhere to the true Order of St. Francis. After Examination and Deliberation had, the Recollects were found to adhere to the ancient Institutions of their Order; and thereupon Judgment was published on their behalf, and they were afterwards called the Reformed Franciscans. Such (faith he) is the State of the Reformed Churches at this Day: The true Church was first planted and established by Christ and his Apostles, which continued sound

* Sir Humphrey Lynde in the Preface to his *Via Devia*.

in Head and Members for many Ages ; but afterwards, when Error and Superstition had crept in and gotten the upper-hand, there were certain Recollects, who complained of the Corruptions and Errors, which had sprung up in the Roman Church. Whereupon, after mature Deliberation had of the true Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, Publication was made in behalf of the Recollects, that they were found to adhere to the Institutions of Christ and his Apostles ; and from that Time, they were called the Reformed Churches.

CHAP. IX.

I NOW proceed to your Fourteenth Paragraph, in which with a Presumption common to all your Curial Doctors, you speak of Rome Christian as *URBS ÆTERNA*, in arrogating to her the Promises of perpetual Duration. *It follows, (say you) 3dly, That the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church : For, some Church must be the true Church of Christ ; and it can be none, to whom the Promises of Indefeasibility or perpetual Duration have not been made good : But these Promises have not been made good to any but the Roman Catholic Church, and have evidently fail'd all Protestants for the space of 900 or 1000 Years : Therefore the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of Christ. Sir,* this Paragraph is resolvable into two plain categorical Syllogisms, whereof this is the first. *Some one Church must be the true Church of Christ ; But no Church but the Roman Catholic Church is*

that one true Church : Therefore the Roman Catholick Church must be the true Church of Christ. Let us examine each of the Premisses of this Syllogism in order : *Some one Church must be the true Church of Christ.* To which I answer, that *the true Church of Christ* is taken either in the general Signification, for the one holy Catholick Church of all the Faithful dispersed over the Earth, of which Christ alone is the Head ; or in the particular Signification for *this* or *that* particular Church, which in some part or other of the Earth is a Member of the one holy Catholick Church. In the former Signification, in which you [still abusively] take it, this Proposition is not only false, but a Contradiction ; because *some Church*, that is, some one particular Church cannot be the whole Church of Christ : For if it is the whole Church, it cannot be some one Church, as I have shewed above. The second or *minor* Proposition is this ; *But no Church but the Roman Catholick Church is that one true Church :* Which is false ; because, as I have proved above, it is neither the true Church nor a true Church of Christ, as *true* signifies sound, pure, or truly Catholick in a moral Sense : And therefore your Conclusion is false, which is this ; *Therefore the Roman (miscalled) Catholick Church must be the true Church of Christ.*

II. THE second Syllogism, by which you prove the minor Proposition, is this ; *No Church, to which the Promises of Indefectibility or perpetual Duration have not been made good, is the true Church of Christ : But those Promises have not been made good to any but the Roman Catholick Church : Therefore the Roman Catholick Church is the true Church of Christ.* Sir, the truth and certainty of this Conclusion

clusion ought to be made out from most sure and
 evident Principles, if you would convince any of
 us, who are not Members of your Church: But
 the Principles from which you go about to prove
 it, are neither sure nor true; and so far from
 having any Evidence of Truth and Certainty, that
 they are clearly false. I'll begin *with the major*.
 Proposition: *No Church, to which the Promises*
of Indefeasibility or perpetual Duration have not
been made good, is the true Church of Christ. No
 Church, *i. e.* no one Church, to which the Pro-
 mises of Indefeasibility and perpetual Durati-
 on, &c. Here, Sir, after your usual manner, you
 suppose what is not true, take for granted what
 we never granted to you, and shamefully lay it
 down as a Principle without any previous Proof,
that there is some one particular Church above all
others, to which Christ made the Promises of In-
defeasibility or perpetual Duration. Before you made
 this Proposition a *Premise* to infer such a Con-
 clusion, you ought to have made good Proof of it;
 but instead of proving it, you doughtily suppose it
 to be true: And a bold Supposition in a Guide,
 who is himself supposed not capable to deceive,
 will pass for an Argument with such easie Pro-
 felytes, as give up themselves to his Conduct. But,
 Sir, I challenge you to prove this Proposition;
 and if you can make clear and substantial Proof of
 it, I will surrender my self; and be your Prose-
 lyte; and you shall send me, as the Roman General
 did *Caractacus*, to be led in Triumph at Rome. In
 the mean time, I beseech you to tell me, if the
 Churches of *Sardis*, *Pergamos*, and *Thyatira*, the
Persian, the *African* Churches, were not true
 Churches in their Time; and yet you will not say,
 the *Promises of perpetual Duration* were made to
 them: You will not say it, because in your *mi-*
M 3
nor

nor Proposition you say, in effect, they were made to none but the Church of *Rome*; for if they were made good to none but the Church of *Rome*, then they were made to none but the Church of *Rome*, because God makes no Promises which he doth not make good. Likewise you will not say it, because they have been utterly destroyed, and are become like the Dead, as if they had never been. I pray you also to tell me, if the four Patriarchal Churches of the East, *Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople*, (two whereof are ancients than that of *Rome*) were not, and as much as you dispise them, still are true Churches; though, according to your Doctrine, the Promises of Indefectibility, or perpetual Duration were not made to them: And if these, without Christ's making or making good these Promises to them, were and are true Churches, and the first, for some time after the beginning of Christianity, the only true and Catholick Church of Christ; then it is false, that no one Church can be the true Church of Christ, to which the Promises of perpetual Duration have not been made good.

III. HAVING examined your *major*, let us proceed to your *minor* Proposition, which is this; *But these Promises have not been made good to any but the Roman Catholick Church.* The Promises you mean, are in *Matth. xvi. 17, 18, 19. xxviii. 20. Luke xxii. 32. John xv. 16. xvi. 13.* not to mention what your *Civill* Writers are wont to argue in their *Way* from *Rom. 1. 8.* But to say they have not been made good to any but the *Roman Catholick Church*, is to suppose they have been made only to the *Roman Church*; which is false, because they have been made to no one Church at all. I challenged you above, to prove, that

that Christ made these Promises to any particular Church; and now I challenge you, to prove he made them to the Church of Rome: And if you cannot prove that, how will you prove that he made them only to that Church, or to none but that? They were made to the whole Hierarchical State or Ministry of the Gospel, and by Consequence to the Church in general, as the Command † *Pasce Agnos, Pasce Oves meas*, John xxi. was given in the Person of St. Peter to the Hierarchical State in all succeeding Times, and by Consequence to the whole Pastoral or Governing Church. There is no doubt to be made of the Doctrine of the Church's Indeficiency, and of the Obligation of Christ its Head and High Priest, who is faithful and just to preserve it, so that it shall not quite fail or be destroy'd, either by * Heresy, Apostacy, or outward Violence and Persecution, which are the Ways by which the Powers of Hell endeavour to destroy it: No, he will so defend his Catholick Church, that it shall neither quite fall away from him, by falling off from the ancient Catholick and Apostolical Faith and Ministry, nor be quite extinguished by Persecution, which the Ancients always ascribed to the Instigation of the Devils; but he will always have a Church upon Earth, which shall retain the Apostolical Faith and Ministry, by Tradition

† *Augustini Expositiones in Evang. Joh. Tractatus CXXIV.* See Lamy Epist. ad. N. Gatineum, and Neilus, and Barlaam, of the Pope's Supremacy; where those Texts are particularly vindicated from your corrupt Interpretation of them.

* *Ipsa est Ecclesia sancta, Ecclesia una; Religio vera, Ecclesia Catholica contra omnes haereses pugnant, pugnare potest, expugnari tamen non potest. Haereses omnes — exierint tanquam sementa inutilia de vite praecisa, ipsa autem manet in radice sua, in vite sua, in charitate sua; porta inferorum non vincet eam.* August. de Symbolo ad Catechumenos. Tom. IX.

and Succession from the Apostles, † though both your Church and ours had lost their Being, and become no Churches by Heresy, Apostacy, or Persecution. He can remove your Candlestick, when he pleases, to any other Place where they yet sit in Pagan Darkness, and in the Region and Shadow of Death. *There are many barren places, which are yet to rejoice : And as God did formerly chuse ; so I am persuaded he will again chuse the foolish Things of the World to confound the Wise, and the weak Things of it to confound the Things that are Mighty ; nay, base Things in the Eye of the World and, your worldly Church, will he chuse, and Things which are despised and Things that are not, to bring to nought Things that are, that no Flesh should glory in his Presence.* He can call the *Jews* and make *Jerusalem*, the true Mother of us all which now dwelleth among the Heathen, once again great among the Nations, and restore the Daughter of *Sion* which hath long mourned, to her former Beauty, and make *Jewry* once more a Holy Land, and the Joy and Glory of the whole Earth. He can plant as glorious a Church in the South, as he once had in the North of *Africk* ; he can call the *Hottentots*, and *Tartars*, and most savage *Americans*, as easily as he did the *Goths* and *Britains* to the Faith ; and all this he can do, tho' your Church were no more : And all that he is obliged to do by the Promises of Indefectibility or Perpetuity, is some where or other to have a pure Church upon Earth ; I mean, so pure that one may communicate in it without Sin. The Church Catholic began in one single Congregation ; and should he have but one single Congregation upon Earth

† See Dr. *Forbes's Instruções Historico. Theologica*, Lib xvi. Cap. vi. 2.

at the end of the World, yet those Promises would be fulfilled, because they obliged him to no more than still to preserve his Church; but as to the number or greatness of Churches which he will preserve, and the Places where he will preserve them, he hath made no Promise, but left himself free.

IV. HAVING shewed, that the Promises of Perpetuity were not made to any one particular Church, I cannot but observe how improper and absurd it is in you to say, *They have not been made good to any, but the Roman Catholick Church.* For although the *Roman Catholick Church* hath not ceased to be, but hath been hitherto perpetuated for so many Ages; yet its Indeficiency to this time proceeds from the mere Grace and favourable Providence of God, who preserves one part of his Church and destroys another, as he pleases; and not from his Veracity in fulfilling those Promises, which only oblige him to perpetuate his Catholick Church, but not any one Branch or Member thereof. Indeed he may make good those Promises, if he pleases, in perpetuating the *Roman Church* to the end of the World, and letting others quite perish. But so he may make them good in perpetuating the Church of *England* (as I trust he will) or any other Church, and letting that utterly perish from off the Earth; and in what particular Church or Churches present or to come, he will perpetuate his Catholick Church to the end of the World, or in what state or degree of Peace and Purity or freedom from Error, is only known to himself, nor can be known to Man without a Revelation till the last Day. 2dly, As to the Blessing of a continued Preservation, which the *Roman Church* arrogates to it self under the Name of *Perpetuity*, it

it hath been hitherto granted to many Churches, as well as to her. The Church of *Jerusalem*, which is elder Sister to the Church of *Rome*, hath continued, tho' not flourished, from its first Foundation. The Church of the *Abyssine Ethiopia*, founded by the care of *St. Athanasius*, hath continued and flourished without interruption, from the first Day of its Being to this present Day; and so has the Church which was founded in *Great Britain*, continued, tho' not always flourished (which is promised to no part of the *Militant Church*) from the time of its first Plantation in the Reign of *Tiberius Caesar* to this Day. The Faith of Christ was preached here, in all probability, as soon as in *Rome* it self, and hath been conveyed down to us from that time to this, by a continued Succession of a lawful Ministry, by Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Our *Saxon* Ancestors had their Bishops partly from the *Scotish*, and partly from the *Roman Church*: And as we are equal to you in a lawful Succession of Bishops, and by consequence of Priests, without interruption; so we have this Advantage over you, that together with the Blessing of Perpetuity to this time, we have the happiness to be reformed from the common Errors and Corruptions, in which we were both equally involved. I have added this, because you have the confidence to assert, That *the Promises of Indefectibility and Perpetuity have evidently failed all Protestants, for the space of 900 or 1000 Years*; though we have continued a Church without interruption as long as you, and at present by the Mercy of God, are in a much purer state.

V. I TAKE no notice of the crudity and absurdity of your Expression, in saying, *those Promises have failed all Protestants for the space of*
900

900 or 1000 Years ; as if our Ancestors, who then professed our Faith and not yours, could be called *Protestants* in propriety of Speech, who had no such Popish Errors and Corruptions, no such Popish Abuses and Innovations, nor any Popish new Creeds to *protest* against, as we have. To conclude, Sir, That part of *Asia*, into which *Noah* and his Family went out of the Ark near Mount *Ararat* (now thought to be *Armenia*) about the rise of *Tigris*, may with as much reason arrogate to it self the general Promise, which God made *never to destroy the Earth again*, as your Church arrogate the Promises of Perpetuity. I say *Armenia* by the same way of Reasoning, may appropriate to it self the general Promise *never to destroy the Earth again*, because it was made in that Country to *Noah*, after he had built an Altar and sacrificed there. And therefore give me leave to expose your false and presumptuous way of Reasoning, to make an *Armenian* use it in this manner. Some Country must be the place, to which God made the Promise of never cursing the Ground again with a Flood ; and it can be none to which that Promise hath not been made good : But that Promise hath not been made good to any Country but *Armenia* : Therefore *Armenia* must be the place, to which God made the Promise of never cursing the Ground again with a Flood. Sir, I beseech you look back upon your way of proving, and compare it with this, and then shew me the difference between them, if you can.

VI. YOUR Sixteenth Paragraph being but a repetition of what I have answered, I shall pass it over without any farther trouble, than to animadvert upon two Expressions in it: *We follow the Guidance of the Church, they their own. Either their Religion or ours is a damnable Heresy.*

As

As to the first, it is great arrogance in you to say you *follow the Guidance of the Church*. If that be true, will you shew us your Religion, wherein it differs from ours, in the purest Ages of the Church for the first 500 Years? You have asked me, where our Religion was 900 or 1000 Years before *Luther*; and I have shewed you where it then was, even where the Popish part of your Religion then was not, all over the Christian World, particularly in the Church of *England*; and if you cannot shew me the like of your Religion, then it is impossible you should *follow the Guidance of the Church*. If you *followed the Guidance of the Church*, you would have Catholick Tradition and Scripture expounded by Catholick Tradition on your side. But Catholick Tradition, which consists in Antiquity, Universality, and Consent, is against you: For instead of Antiquity, you have set up Novelty; instead of Universality, your own particular Traditions; and instead of Consent, only the Testimony and Authority of your own representative Church in the Council of *Trent*, whose Definitions you miscall *the Guidance of the Church*. * A packed Council it was, that was neither free nor general: Not free, because the Pope, the chief Person to be reformed, was President of it, and proposed all things by his *Le-*

* Relation of the Conference between Archbishop *Laud* and Mr. *Fisher*, printed at London MDCLXXIII. p. 140. defended against the Exceptions of *Labyrinthus Cantuariensis*, by Dr. *Stillingfleet*, in his *Rational Account*, &c. printed MDCLXXXI. chap. viii. See also the *Review of the Council of Trent*, by Monsieur *Rancin*, first written in French, and translated into English by Dr. *Ger. Langbain*, printed at Oxford, 1638.

gates ; and because none had Suffrage in it, but such as were sworn to him and the Church of *Rome*. And as it was not free, so neither was it general : For the *Greek Churches* had no Bishops in it, who were chosen and sent by them, to represent them in it. And as for the Western Parts of Christendom, in all the Sessions under *Paul III.* there were but two *French Men*, and sometimes none, as in the sixth under *Julius III.* when the *French King* protested against the Council. And as for *England*, there were but three Bishops, *Gouldwell* of *St. Asaph*, *Pates* of *Worcester*, and another whose Name I do not remember, who sat in that Council, and subscribed to the Decrees of it ; but none of them were sent thither by any Authority from the Church or State of *England* : But the Pope thought fit to summon them among the rest of his Creatures. Bishop *Jewell*, in his Letter to *Seignior Scipio*, gives him Reasons why Queen *Elizabeth* would send none of her Bishops to the Council of *Trent* ; which Letter is extant in the last *English Edition* of Father *Paul's History* of the Council of *Trent*. Neither was it any Wonder that *England* sent no Bishops thither : For Pope *Leo* declared the Appellants Heretics, before they were condemned by the Council ; and so it was not a Lawful Council, but an Assembly of Enemies. Besides, there were many *Curial* titular Bishops in it, who had no Subsistence but the Pope's Purse ; and of the whole Number that sat in it, there were more *Italian Bishops* by 104, than of all the Christian World besides ; and by such a Majority, his Infallibility might infallibly assure himself to have whatsoever he would determined. Thus, Sir, you did not follow the guidance of the *Catholick Church*, but your own ; and yet this
packed

packed Synod * insolently styles it self *Oecumenical*, and speaks of it self as of the Representative of the Catholick Church, and to be || guided by the Holy Ghost, which I need not put you in remembrance of, who told us was *sent to the Council in the Pope's Port-manteau*. And truly, you follow the Guidance of the Church in following that Council, as much as that Council followed the Guidance of the Holy Ghost in following the Pope; and how much that was, let its own Definitions and the Creed of *Pius IV.* speak. On the contrary, we follow both the Example and Guidance of the Church. Its Example, in making use of our own right to call a National Synod for a Reformation, when we could not obtain it by a General Council; and its Guidance, in making Scripture expounded by Catholick Tradition, our Rule of Faith. We follow Antiquity, Universality, and Consent; and therefore we follow the Church, the primitive Church; to her and her General Councils we appeal against you and your particular Council of *Trent*, and by the consentient Doctrines of her Fathers we offer, we desire to be tried.

VIII. AND whereas you assert, that either your Religion or ours is a damnable Heresy, you may take as much of damnable Heresy to your selves, as you deserve. But as for us, I challenge you to shew any one damnable or dangerous Heresy or Heretical Doctrine, that we profess.

* *Sessio I. Sacrosancti oecumenici & generalis Concilii Tridentini sub Paulo III. — celebrata.*

|| *Sessio XXV. Cum Catholica Ecclesia Spiritu Sancto edocita — Novissime in hac oecumenica Synodo docuerit Plagiarium. — Sessio XVI. Sacrosancta oecumenica & generalis Synodus, in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata.*

Nay,

Nay, I challenge you to shew any one dangerous positive or negative Doctrine, that the Church of *England* holds, or that she doth not hold all things needful to Salvation. But if false and dangerous, or absurd and impossible, nay pernicious and impious Doctrines, contrary to Scripture expounded by Catholick Tradition, derogatory to the Honour of Jesus Christ and the Christian Religion, and destructive of the Rights and Liberties of the Catholick Church, be damnable Heresies; then your Religion, by which I mean *the Popery of it*, is a multiform damnable Heresy; as we doubt not but a truly Free and General Council, could such a one be had, would soon determine; and to such a Council we are ready to appeal.

VIII. SIR, I have observed throughout this Answer to your Reply, how falsely, fallaciously, and precariously you arrogate the glorious Titles of *the Church, the Church of Christ, the Catholick Church, the Holy Catholick Apostolick Church, and the one Holy Catholick Church*. Sec. to your Church, *i. e.* Church of *Rome*, and those Churches which communicate with her, exclusively of all others. So all your *English* Writers that I have read, do; contracting the Catholick Church to the *Roman Church* and Communion, which for that Reason they call the *Roman Catholick Church*: So you [Missioners and curial Writers] would be always understood to mean, when you speak of the Tradition of the Church, the Testimony of the Church, the Authority of the Church, the Doctors and Pastors of the Church, the Voice of the Church, the Attestation or continual Attestation of the Church; quite contrary to the Notion of the *Catholick Church*, which the ancient Writers and Councils of it have transmitted

mitted to us, as I have shewed, and as I have observed the modern Writers of the *Greek Church*, and the most free and learned of your own have shewed, as well as we.

IX. THE Matter, or *materia ex quâ*, of the Catholick Church, according to the ancient Testimonies I have produced, is † *all faithful Churches wheresoever dispersed over the World*, as being integral Parts or Members of the One Body of the Holy Catholick Church. The form of it, as of all other politick Bodies or Societies, consists in the union or fellowship of those Members among themselves. and with their common Head. Their union and fellowship among themselves consists in professing the same common Faith (which is therefore called the *Catholick Faith*) in the Administration of the same Sacraments, in having the same Government and Ministry, and in communicating with one another in holy Offices and in all the Acts of Christian Charity, as mutual Help and Assistance in time of Persecution, mutual Beneficence and Liberality in time of Want, mutual participation of one another's Prayers, and in whatsoever else is to be understood by the *Communion of Saints* in the Militant Church. The only Head, in which and under which they are thus united, is Christ, according to that of *Theophylact* in i Cor. xii. which I cited before, καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία ἡ πανταχῶ, &c. *The Catholick Church dispersed over the whole World, whose Body consists of all Churches every where having Christ for its Head.* So St. Chry-

† Quod sit ubique diffusa. Optatus ii. de Schism. Καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης ὡς πλεονέτων, Iren. L. I. C. II. πῶς καθολικὴ ὄντιν ὡς ἀπαρτίζονται οἱ ὀρθόδοξοι Χριστιανοὶ ὁμολογοῦσιν. Barlaam de principatu Papa, Cap. XV.

iii. 1. he is ~~said~~, *The Apostle and chief Priest of our Profession*. So *Eph. ii. 20.* And are built upon the Foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, Jesus Christ being the chief * Corner-stone. These Texts are urged against you by *Nectarius*† Patriarch of *Hierusalem* in these Words: “ This Church, consisting of the Patriarchal Churches, is properly called *Catholick*, and simply or absolutely the Church of God, the Mother of us all, the perfect Spouse of Christ, whose Head Christ is according to the Apostle in *Eph. Chap. i. and ii. and Coloss. i.* And according to *Basil* in his Sermon of the Judgment of God, Christ only is the one Head of the Church. You, saith he (considering the saying of the Apostle) are the Body of Christ and Members in particular, the one and only Head, who is Christ, joining and fitting one part to another in Concord. He might have cited many more of the Greek Fathers, as *Greg. Nazianz. Orat. xxxi. εἰς Χριστός, &c.* One Christ, the one Head of the Church. So *Theodoret* on *i Cor. xi. 3.* Christ is the Head of every Man. i. e. of Believers. And he is our Head, not as God, but as Man. For we are called his Body, and the Head ought to be of the same Nature with the Body, and therefore he is our Head as Man. To the same purpose speaks *Greg. Nyssen.* against *Eunomius, Orat. xii. Vol. ii.* And *Theodoret* on *cviii. Psalm.* The Lord Christ is called Head of the Church, and his Body the Collection of the Church, i. e. The Church taken collectively is called his Body. So *Clem. Alexandr. Stromat. vii.*

* See *Theodoret* on *Pf. cxviii. 22.* and *Theophylact* on *Matth. xxi. Cyrill. Alex.* on *Isaiah xxviii. 16.* *Oecumen.* on *1 Pet. cap. ii. Euseb. demonstrat. Evang. lib. i p. 19.*

† *Confutatio imperij Papæ, p. 341.* cited at large in the Margent of my Answer to your Query.

The Church, that holy spiritual Chorus, is allegorically called the Body of Christ. So Theophylact on St. John chap. xi. Christ hath gathered us together into One, into One Church and One Yoke, making one Body of those who are near and those who are afar off; that he who dwells at Rome should esteem an Indian as his fellow Member, and confess Christ to be the Head of all. So on i Cor. xii. Because they (the Corinthians) did not make up the Body of Christ, but all the faithful all the World over, therefore be added *καὶ μὲν*, and Members. For tho' they were not the whole Body, yet they were Members, and that in particular. For as to the Church that is among you, you are the Body of Christ, as an entire Church: But as to the Catholick Church all the World over, whose Body consists of all Churches in all Places, having Christ for its Head, you are but Members, because you are but a Part of that. This was as true of the Church of Rome in its purest State, as of the Church of Corinth. For the Ancients had no other Notion of it, but as of one particular Church, which was a part of the whole, of which Christ only was the Head. They never used the Catholick Church in the general Sense, but for the whole collective Body of all Christian Churches united under Christ, as their only Head. And when they gave the Title of Catholick Church to the Church of Rome, it was in no other Sense, but that in which they gave it to other particular Patriarchal or Diocesan Churches, to signify that they were faithful parts of the whole Church. This was the Sense in which Gregory Nazianzen called the Church of Constantinople the Catholick Church in the beginning and end of his last Will; *Ἐκκλησίᾳ καθολικῇ ἐν Κωνσταντίνῳ πόλει*, τῇ ἁγίᾳ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἐν Κωνσταντίνῳ πόλει.

Gregory Bishop of the Holy Catholick Church in Constantinople, and in this Sense Polycarp is said to be Bishop of the * Catholick Church of Smyrna, but not to signifie its union with the Church of Rome, more than any other part of the Catholick Church. There were no other Senses then of *Catholick Church* but two: This *general* one, in which it was put for all faithful Churches united into one Body under Christ; and the *particular*, when it was used expressly or implicitly for a particular Church, as I have shewed before, not upon the Account of its union and Agreement with the *Roman*, but with the whole Catholick Church. But Cardinal Peroron to avoid the Force of those two primitive senses and acceptations of *Catholick Church*, invented a third, which the Ancients never knew. It is in a passage of *Labyrinthus Cantuariensis*, and is expressed in these Words. "The word *Catholick* may be
 " *used in three acceptations, viz. either formally, or*
 " *causally, or by way of participation. Formally,*
 " *The universal Church, that is the Society of all*
 " *true particular Churches, united together in one*
 " *Body, in one Communion, and under one Head, is*
 " *called Catholick. † Causally; The Church of Rome*
 " *is stiled Catholick, because it hath an influence and*
 " *force to cause universality in the whole Body of*
 " *the Catholick Church: To which Universality two*
 " *things are necessary, One is Multitude, which*
 " *serves as an Analogical matter, whereof it consists.*
 " *For where there is no Multitude, there can be no*
 " *Universality. The other is in the place of form,*

* Euseb. Hist. Ecc^l. lib. iv. c. xv.

† I think he should have said *efficiently*, because what contributes materially or formally to make the Church Catholick, contributes *causally*, matter and form being two, of the four Causes.

viz.

*viz. Unity. For Multitude without Unity will
 never make Universality. Take away faith (St.
 Augustin.) Unity from Multitude, and it is Turba
 (a Rout) but join it to Unity, and it becomes
 Populus, a Community. The Roman Church
 therefore (which as a Centre of Ecclesiastical
 Communion infuses this Unity, which is the
 form of Universality, into the Catholick Church,
 and thereby causes in her Universality) may be
 called Catholick causally, tho' it be but a particu-
 lar Church. So he who commands in chief over
 the whole Army, and makes an Unity in that mi-
 litary Body, is stiled General, tho' he be but a par-
 ticular Person. Thirdly, Every particular Or-
 thodox Church is term'd Catholick participative,
 by way of participation, because they agree in
 and participate of the Doctrine and Communion
 of the Catholick Church. In this Sense the
 Church of Smyrna addresses her Epistle thus:
 To the Catholick Church of Philomelium, and to
 all the Catholick Churches, which are spread
 through the whole World. Sir, I have transcribed
 this Passage for the sake of the Cardinal's second
 Acceptation of Catholick Church, because I was
 willing you should know I was not ignorant of it,
 and because I would save you the Labour of making
 use of it against me by the following Considera-
 tions. For 1. as it is perfectly new, so the sense of
 it is unknown to Antiquity, which as I have shewn
 from numerous Testimonies, speaks of no Unity of
 the Catholick Church under any one Head, but Christ.
 [St. Augustin your great Latin Father, conformably
 to those of the Greek Church, speaks of no other
 Head of the Church, but Christ, not once mention-
 ing the Bishop of Rome as his external Minister or
 Vicar over the Universal Church.] Nay, Sir, con-
 sult him de Civ. Dei, lib. xxi. cap. 18. Item in*

Evang. Johan. xlv, & xlix, & lxi. De verbis Apost. Serm. xxxiii. Tom. x. Enarrat. in Psalm. xxxvi. concio. iii. De decem chordis, cap. 1. But above all others, in Serm. lxi. in Evang. Johan. Princeps hujus mundi jam judicatus est, id est, Diabolus Princeps iniquorum, &c. The Prince of this World is judged, that is, the Devil, the Prince of the ungodly, who live not with their Hearts any where but in this World, whereas our Conversation is in Heaven, if we are risen with Christ. Wherefore in like manner as Christ is one with us who are his Body; so the Devil is one with the Ungodly, as with his Body, of which he is the Head. So in Enarrat. Psalm. cxxxix. Sed tamen non propter ista isti cavendi sunt, &c. But of these (Supplanters) heed is not to be taken for these things, but lest they draw thee by their wiles to themselves, that is, divide thee from the Body of Christ, and make thee a Member of their own Body. For as Christ is the Head of the Godly, so the Devil is their Head.

These are the two Heads to their respective Bodies. And as you will grant, that the Devil hath, no one external ministerial Head under him in his Kingdom upon Earth; so neither, if this comparison be exactly like, hath Christ any such in his. If there were any Difference between them in this respect, methinks the Father when he made this comparison, should have observ'd it, if he had known it. But his and all the other Fathers utter silence unto his time of such a ministerial Vicegerent of Christ over his Church, is a just and strong presumption, that they never heard of any such. On the contrary, according to the Authorities you have given me Occasion to produce out of their Writings, Christ alone is the Head, in and under whom the Multitude of Churches are formally united into one Community, which makes them one universal Church. He is the Center of Catholick Communion, the true

Vine

Vine to all the Branches of the Catholick Church, the Vital Head, which by the influence of his holy Spirit infuses Unity into the Members of his mystical Body, as it is written, *One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all.* 2dly, I must pray you to observe the inconsistency of the Cardinal with other Writers in his new distinction, which he invented to shew, that the Church of *Rome* is the Principle of Catholick Unity and the Center of Ecclesiastical Communion to all other Churches, that forms them into one Body, and by consequence is, as Logicians observe, like the *last Unit* which forms and specifies the Number; or, as he speaks, like him that commands in chief over the whole Army, who makes an Unity in that military Body, and is therefore stiled *General*, tho' he be but a particular Person. But then how doth this new notion of the Cardinal's strictly agree with the notion of other Writers, which makes not the Church, but the Bishop of *Rome* the Principle of Catholick Unity and center of Ecclesiastical Communion? For the one is a Society, and the other a single Person: And to turn his similitude upon him, they have as different Conceptions, as in an Army, the General's own Regiment and the General himself; or in an University, the Vice-Chancellor's College and the Vice-Chancellor himself. If the Pope of *Rome* be the Principle of Catholick Unity, then the Principle of Catholick Unity is a Person; but if the Church of *Rome* be the Principle of it, then it is a whole Society: But be it the one or the other, I must entreat you in the third place before you make use of the Cardinal's notion and distinction, to consider how you will reconcile it to the Writings of St. *Cyprian*, who hath said so many things to

show, that he never thought the Church, or Pope of Rome to be the Head or centre of Catholick Unity and Communion, or that the Catholick Church was *causally* so called from the the Roman Church. These notions do not agree with his bix Epistle in the Oxford Edition to *Cornelius*, nor with his notion of every Bishop's being accountable to none but God, for what he acts in his own *Diocesis*. That there was but one Episcopate in the universal Church; part of which was committed to every Bishop in full; not to mention other things, particularly those which he (and others) wrote to and of the Popes of those times, especially to † *Stephanus*, which you shall have more at large with many other things to that purpose, when

† *Cyprianus Pontifex*. *Non inter ista sapenda, &c.* Among other fierce and impertinent things which contradict one another, and which he wrote with as great ignorance as indiscretion, &c. Afterwards *Cur in tantum Stephanus, &c.* Why did the obstinate perverseness of our Brother Stephen break out to that degree? *Fittillizans Cyprianus*. *Nisi quod nos gratiam referre, &c.* However I am obliged to Stephen for this, that his inhumanity was the occasion of my receiving the proof of your Fidelity and Wisdom. But tho' I occasionally received this benefit and favour by Stephen; yet Stephen did nothing that deserves thanks. For tho' *Julian* did so much good in bringing to pass the Redemption of the World by his falsest and wicked Treachery towards our Saviour, yet no Man ever thought him worthy of thanks. But I pass by the things that Stephen hath done, lest by relating his boldness, and insolence, and wicked deeds, I should increase my Grief—*Atque eo in hunc patere justè indignus, &c.* And upon this score I justly resent this so open and manifest madness of Stephen, because he, who so glories of the place of which he is Bishop, and maintains that it is he, who holds the Succession of Peter, upon whom the foundations of the Church are placed, may introduce many other *Perversas* and erect new Buildings of many Churches, &c.

Certainly those who treated the person, and judgment, and proceedings of Pope Stephen with so little respect, never believed

when you please. [Nay, these notions do not at all agree with the History of the Division between the *Asiatick* Churches and the Church of *Rome* about the Observation of *Easter*, as it is related by *Eusebius* in his *Ecclesiastical History*, *Lib. v. Cap. 23, 24.* whither I refer you, and desire to know, when Pope *Victor* cut off those Churches from Communion with him and his Church, whether thereupon they ceased to be Catholic Churches, or faithful Members of the Holy Catholic Church? The like I may ask of *St. Cyprinus*, when cut off by Pope *Stephen* from the Communion of the *Roman* Church. According to the Cardinal's Notion, Those holy Bishops and their Flocks were but a *multitude without Unity*, a *meer Rout* of Christians, like so many cashier'd Regiments of an Army without a *General*, and wholly cut off and alienated from Christ, because separated from his Viceroy and Vicar upon Earth, and only visible and ministerial Head of the Church. As little do they agree with his History of the deposition of *Paulus Samosatenus*, *Lib. vii. Cap. 29, 30.* Or with his History of the Censure and Condemnation of *Novatianus*, *Lib. vi. Cap. 43.* They do not agree with the v. and vi. Canons of the Council of *Nice*, and to pass over other Councils and Fathers, they do not agree with the Inscriptions of the Letters of *Justinian* the Emperor to the *Roman* Bishops in the *Code*, nor with the Declarations and Invectives of

heved him to be the restorer of Unity, as Successor to *St. Peter*, or universal Bishop and Head of the Church. And as to *Firminus*, to give some account of him: He was Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia*. He sat in the first Council of *Antioch* against *Paulus Samosatenus*. He continued a Catholic to his Death; and after Death was honoured by the whole Church, as a Saint. As *Lambertus* in his Preface to his French Translation of *St. Cyprinus's* Works, observes against *Basilius*, who vainly asserts he made *Skipper* of the Faith.

Gregory

Gregory the Great against the Title of *Universal Bishop*, nor with the behaviour and synodical * Answer of the *British Bishops* to *Augustin* his Apostle; for they could not be brought by his Exhortations, or Threatnings, or Miracles; as was reported; to take him for their Arch-Bishop; they told him they ought him no Obedience, nor would alter the religious Rites and Customs of the *British Church*.] Wherefore, Sir, I must entreat you when you write next, not to speak of the present Church of *Rome* (in which I include the Churches in Communion with it) either expressly or by implication, as the || whole Catholick Church or the one Holy Catholick Church: I must entreat you not to take that for granted any more, because it was never spoken of as such, when it was a sound and orthodox Church. And now it is so corrupt, that that it is not so much as a part of the One Holy Catholick Church, it is a great imposition upon us to imply or suppose, that it is the whole, and still so

* *Bede Hist. Eccl. Lib. 2. Cap. 2.*

|| Sed dic clariss, cur Catholicæ Romanam addis? Si Romana idem quod Catholica, nugatio est perinde ac si Catholicam Catholicam dicas; si Catholicæ addita Romana distinguit Catholicam, erit & alia Catholica, quæ non Romana, & nostra erit simpliciter Catholica, licet non Romana—quid si Catholicam dicas, quæ est Orthodoxa, quo sensu & Alexandrina à Constantino M. & Civitates Africanæ multæ ab Augustino, & Constantinopolitana, & Antiochenæ, &c. ab aliis Catholicæ olim dictæ, nos Romanam Antiquam, ut Catholicam sic agnoscimus. Quæ verò nunc est Romana, quia non Orthodoxa, ne sic quidam Catholica. Verbo tibi dico, & verè, Catholica nullo modo est Romana. Tua vero Romana, nec Orthodoxa est, nec Catholica. Sed Commentator hio esse vis. Videamus verò, quam sis bellus interpres. Ecclesia (inquis) dicitur Catholica Romana, non illa solum specialis quæ Romæ est, sed illæ omnes, quæ unitate fidei & subjectione ad Romanum Pontificem illi sunt conjunctæ. Catholica vero nec sic etiam Romana. Quæ sit Romana est, papisticam dicas non Catholicam. Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ contra Archiep. Spalatensem Richardi Crakanthorp, cap. 3. p. 14.

to

to speak or write without Proof, as if it were a common Principle between us, that it was not only a Catholick but the Catholick Church.

CH A P X.

I HAVE now, Sir, done with your Reply, but not with you. For, First, in answer to my Letter, in which I told you I desired to be excused from sending back your Papers, because I might have occasion to produce them; you say *you entred upon this Engagement, upon Assurance that you had to do with a Man of Honour, who would not do any thing that would render the Dispute between us of greater Noise, than was convenient for your Circumstances.* This you say you were assured of before you began, and this you expect from a Person of my Character. Sir, if by a greater Noise you mean publishing the Dispute between us, I never gave you, or your Profelyte, or any other Person that Assurance; nor know I any such Reason as you suggest, why you should expect it from me. As for Personal Danger, you are safe, first, because I do not know who or where you are. But, secondly, if I did, you are safe in my Principles and Temper, who am an old fashion'd Christian, one of that passive Primitive Sort, *qui maluit occidi quam occidere*, that had rather have my own Blood shed in defence of my Religion, than be accessary to shedding of the Blood or destroying the liberty of any other Man. But if by *convenient for your Circumstances*, you mean the great Convenience to your Enimies of making Profelytes among us as they do, without let or hindrance, and giving you all

all the Ease and Opportunity you can wish for, as much as if you had a Toleration; I hope you do not expect for your *Contentment* in that Sense; that I should be silent, and forbear to publish the Dispute between us, unless we had the same Liberty of proselyting the People in *Popish* Countries, that you, notwithstanding the Laws made against you, have and are like to have in ours. If you would let us with safety teach our Reformed Religion in the *Popish* Countries, you should teach your Unreformed Doctrines among us, as securely as you pleased; but you are sensible how much, how vastly much we should be gainers and you losers by that Bargain; and, like the Children of Darkness, you are wiser in your Generation, than to come to such Terms. Wherefore, I hope, Sir, the Wisdom of Government, without making more Laws *ad terrorem*, will in time find a way to discourage your Missioners, and make your Mission and Labours of little or no effect among us; and you ought not to take it ill, or think it contrary to Honour, if I or any other of my Character should contribute our Mites of Interest, and endeavour to bring to pass any Project or Proposal, evidently tending to the Glory of God, the Honour of our Country, the Security of our Church, soft and gentle in it self, harmless to you as to your Persons and Estates, hurtful to nothing but the *Purity* of your Religion, and very profitable and advantageous to the better Defense, more durable Establishment, and constant increase and advancement of ours: or whatsoever I shall think good to say to you.

Secondly, Sir, in return to your Query and Challenge, I must again call upon you to tell me, where the *Roman Church*, i. e. the Religion of the present *Roman Church* was first or Six Hundred Years after the first Preaching of
Chri-

Christianity? Shew me Antiquity, Universality, and Succession through those Centuries for your True Doctrines; or in your own Words a little alter'd, name any Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay, any one single Congregation or Village of Christians in this Period of Time, that professed your Religion, as it differs from ours. I think you are bound in Honour to do it if you can, because you arrogate to your selves the Title of the Holy, and of the one Holy Catholick and Apostolical Church. Nay, Honour obliges you to do it, if you can, upon my Account; who, I hope, have so fairly answer'd your Query and Challenge, in which you called upon me to shew you, where our Church was 900 or 1000 Years before the Reformation. If you do not answer my Query and Challenge, as fairly and particularly as I have answered yours, you must give us leave to think, that your Silence proceeds from the Sense you have, that those Ages afford no Evidence for the Popish Part of your Religion, which we have rejected, but only for that ancient and sound Part of it, which we have retained. Your Interest likewise obliges you to do it, because if you can do it, you'll do all, and put an end for ever to the Controversy, and not only convert us, but all the Protestant World. I say, if you can do it; for I despair of seeing it fairly and honestly done, as did the learned Gentleman Sir Humphrey Lynde cited above, in his † Dedicatory Epistle to the ingenious and

† It is the Dedicatory Epistle to this Book, entituled, *Vita Devis*, printed at London 1630. So Dr. Crakanthorpe, in p. 78. of his Book above-cited. *Audi enim quid hic constanter dicam, demonstra vel tu, vel quisvis ex vestris, non dica Ecclesiam Catholicam, sed vel particularem ullam Ecclesiam, etiam ex tot millibus millibus Myriadum, qui fidem Christi professi sunt, vel unum ali-*

and moderate *Romanists* of this Kingdom. In which, being confident it could not be done, he writes thus: Give me leave therefore by way of Counter-challenge to your Jesuit, to use the Words of Soberness, and Truth; Where was your Church and Trent Doctrine before Luther? For I call God and the heavenly Angels to witness, that notwithstanding you obtrude the Invisibilty of our Church, as a Stumbling-block to the Ignorant, and your great Brags of an outward Face of an eminent and glorious Roman Church; yet your Trent Faith and Doctrine was far from the Knowledge of Christ and his Apostles. Nay more, if any Jesuit or all the Jesuits alive can prove your Roman Faith had Antiquity, Universality, and Succession in all Ages; and that your Trent Articles were commonly and continually taught and received de fide, as Articles of Faith before Luther; let all the Anathema's in your Trent Council fall upon my Head.

Sir, this is the Satisfaction we still want, and for which I call upon you so often, desiring you to shew me *Antiquity, Universality, and Succession* for your Additions to the Old Creed; shew me that they were Ancient and Orthodox Doctrines generally received and revered by Antiquity, as Truths necessarily to be believed in order to Salvati-

aliquem ante sexcentimum à Christo annum, qui fidem istam Tridentinam, quam vos Catholicam, extra quam, nemo salvari potest dicitis, docuit, tenuit, ac professus est, & verbam dabo: viceris: Ego me statim antiquitatis fidei vestra præconem libentissime profitebor. So Dr. Montague in his Preface to the *New Gagg*: If any Papist living or all the Papists living can prove unto me, that all those Points which the Church of Rome maintaineth against the Church of England, were or was the perpetual Doctrine of the Catholick Church; the concluded Doctrine of the representative Church in any General Council, or National approved by a General; or the dogmatical Resolution of any one Father for 500 Years after Christ, I will subscribe.

on,

on, and were transmitted as such by true Catholick Tradition from Age to Age to the Council of *Trent*. Nay, shew me that they were contained or involved in any of the prime Principles or Articles of the Christian Faith, and are clearly deduced from them as Conclusions from their Premisses. If you can shew they have such a connexion with the old Articles of Christian Belief, then you will convince me, that your new Additional Doctrines of Faith are only Explications and Definitions of the old.

You know, † *Vincentius Lirinensis* compares the ancient Creed as to its *Parts*, to the Limbs and Members of a Child's Body, which though they grow and increase to manly Stature, yet remain the same without addition or change. And if you can fairly shew, that your additional Definitions in *Pius IVth's* Creed are only the growth and increase of the Limbs and Parts of the ancient Creed; then I will confess, that it is only encreased by them, and differs no more from the ancient Creed, than a Man from a Boy or Child. You know he also compares the Articles of the old Faith to Grains of Wheat cast into the Ground, which in process of Time grow, and encrease, and get a new Form and outward Appearance without any change of their Nature; and though they multiply, yet they multiply in the same Kind of Grain, which are all wholesome Wheat, and not Tares or poisonous Weeds: According to which Similitude, if you undertake to deduce your additional Doctrines and Definitions from any of the old Principles or Articles of Faith, I must beg leave to put you in remembrance so to do it, that the deduced Doctrines may appear to retain the Nature of the respective old Articles from which you deduce them, and not

† *Commentarii*, cap. 27, 28, 29, 30.

to be of another Kind. If you can do this, you'll do your Church the best Service that ever Man yet did it, much better than *Bellarmin* or the Bishop of *Meaux* did it; and for your Performance you'll deserve a Monument of everlasting Honour, both from her and ours. But if you cannot do this, we must still maintain, That *Pius's* Creed is not *profectus fidei* but *permutatio*, not an encrease but a change of the old Faith, and new not only in the manner but matter thereof, quite of another Kind, and different and disagreeing from the old Creed, and what was taught as necessary to Salvation in the ancient Christian Church. In short, if you can do this, we'll embrace the Confession of *Pius IV.* with as much Reverence and Submission as the *Nicene* or *Constantinopolitan* Creed, which we know and believe to be only an Enlargement or increase of the shorter and more ancient Creed, without Addition of Parts or Alteration, only containing an Exposition or Declaration of the same Articles in more Words, [according to the † sense of the ancient Church,] and not the least new Matter of Faith. Do but make this appear of *Pius's* Creed, and I am yours, and will reverence the Council of *Trent*, as much as that of the first Council of *Nice*. But till you can do this, till you can make all this appear to me out of the Records of the Church, I must believe and affirm, that you have not declared or defined the old Faith, or any part of it in your Additions, but coined a new one in Matter as well as in form. Nay, though you declare that the Church cannot make an Article of Faith, as she cannot write a *Canonical Book of Scripture*, yet till you

† This is so true, that the Word *Quæritur* was used by the Writers of the Church before the Council of *Nice*,

can prove your Additions to the old Creed to be nothing else but a farther Amplification and Defence thereof, I must look upon them as so many new † *Artus* or *Membra*, which are not to be found in the Body of the Apostles Creed; that is, as so many new imposed Articles, which with the old you say is the *true Catholick Faith, out of which no Man can be saved*. And for imposing of which your Church is answerable to God and a truly free and general Council, when such an one can be had. Your Writers define an *Article of Faith* to be a Doctrine, which containeth some special reason of Difficulty in it self, for which *it requireth a particular and distinct Revelation, because it cannot be inferred or deduced out of any other revealed Truth*. And one of them gives for Example, the Article of our *Saviour's Resurrection*, which is a different Point of Faith from that of his *Death and Passion*, as this is from that of his *Nativity*, each of which require a distinct and several Revelation from the other: Because, saith he, Christ might have been born and not died upon the Cross, and died upon the Cross and yet not risen the third Day from the Dead. According to this Definition and Explication of an Article, I must charge your Church with making new Articles of Faith, because so many of her Definitions *de fide* are so difficult, as to require particular and distinct Revelations, by reason they cannot be inferred or deduced out of any other Article or revealed Truth. And therefore your Church teaching Doctrines to be *de fide*, which by reason of the special Difficulties that attend them require

† *Parva leſſantium Membra, magna juvenum: Eadem ipſa ſunt tamen. Quot parvulorum artus, tot virorum.* Vincent. Liſinenſis Common. cap. 29.

so many particular Revelations, because they cannot be inferred from any revealed Truth, is guilty of forging new Articles or imposing new Doctrines, as Articles of Faith (necessary to be taught by all Priests and believed by all Christian People) which you neither have deduced, nor can, as I believe, deduce from other *revealed Truths*, and which therefore require so many particular and distinct Revelations, that they may be believed. Many false Teachers and Hereticks of this Age pretend Revelations for the new Doctrines which they teach, because they know they were never taught before; but your Church takes upon her to teach new Doctrines, and imposes the Belief of them upon us, as necessary to Salvation, without any Pretences to new Revelations, only by Virtue of a pretended, unerring, and infallible Authority, which she arrogates to her self,

But, Sir, it will be to your Honour to justify her Claim, and acquit her of this Charge of forging new Articles or novel Doctrines for our Belief, which Antiquity never taught, either as Truths or Truths necessary to Salvation; and which therefore require, that you should either shew us their Connexion with the old in a Chain of true Consequences, or let us know when and to whom they were revealed, as Parts of the true Catholick Faith, which all Christian Men ought to believe. It will be the best Work of your Life, if you can do it; a Work truly worthy of you and all your Catholick Doctors, as they are pleased to stile themselves; a Work of the greatest Moment to the Christian World; and if you think you can do it, I beseech you by all your Christian Charity to do it for my sake, who otherwise am like to die in what they and you call Heresy and Schism.

if

If I live to see it done by you or any other of your learned Writers, I will bless the Day that I entered into Controversy with you; and then reverence the present, as much as I ever did the ancient Church of Rome, and declare the *Roman Catholic* and the *one holy Catholick and Apostolick Church* to be the same Thing. Sir, I make this Declaration to you sincerely upon my Christian Faith and Honour; for if I am in an Error with the Church of *England*, I am so unwillingly; my Mistake is my Misfortune, more than my Fault, who abhor the direful Nature of Heresy and Schism, of which I have always had dreadful Apprehensions; and that I might never fall into either, I have to the best of my Understanding always diligently examined the Pretensions of all Churches, by the Golden Rule of Scripture expounded by *Antiquity*, *Universality*, and *Consent*. This is the Rule, by which General Councils guided themselves in their Debates and Determinations, particularly the Third, which met at *Ephesus* against *Nestorius*, as *Vincen-tius Lirinensis* shews in the Forty Second Chapter of his Book.

To this Rule I resolve to stick, till you can shew me a better; by this Rule in particular I have tried your Religion with all due Care, Diligence, and Attention, both as to its Doctrine, Worship, and Polity, and find it very disagreeable to it in every Point. Which, I must confess, hath hitherto given me such an Idea of your Church, as I am not forward to express. But whatever Apprehensions I may have of it or Aversion to it, I have a peaceable Mind and perfect Charity and Good-will towards Men of all Orders, Ranks, and Degrees in it. And I trust in God, that Difference in Religion between you and us shall never have any ill Influence over my Practice, or tempt me to make any

Distinction, as to the Performance of relative Duties, between Persons of your Communion and our own. The Duties of Humanity and Natural Justice, which are common to us with all Men, are of great and sacred Obligation; not to mention those with which our common Christianity hath more particularly charged our Consciences, as to our Behaviour in Charity, Prudence; and Honesty towards all Men; to them we think *without*, as carefully as them within; to Unbelievers, as well as Believers; strictly commanding us to give no Offence to *Jews* or *Greeks*, or to those of the Church of God. Sir, with a Sense of these unalterable Duties to you and all others of your Religion I have hitherto written, and shall proceed to write in the Controversy between us; and however it may determine, I shall continue to be

Your faithful Friend and Servant,

G E O. H I C K E S.

Some

Some LETTERS, which passed between Dr. Hickes and his unknown Adversary, from the second to the twenty fourth Day of April, 1714, before the Doctor sent the foregoing printed Answer to his Reply.

April the 2d, 1714.

SIR,

SINCE I am apt to be persuaded, that there is a wide Difference betwixt the answering of a Difficulty propos'd, and the pretending to be able easily to do it; I wish you would take the Pains to make me sensible of this Mistake, as far as relates to our Purpose. And to make an easy Matter yet easier, let us strip our selves of all superfluous Words, Digressions, Jest, or other Artifices of prolonging the Dispute, and shut up our selves to be try'd by the force of our Reasons alone: Which if we have the Assurance to do, we shall soon see the Arms drop out of the Hands of one of us. One would think that after having study'd amongst you for this 150 Years and more, you should have an Answer ready to this *Thread-bare* Question. *By what Linage do you make your Descent good from the fourth Century to the pretended*

O.3

Re.

Reformation? If by the Roman Catholicks, answer the Difficulties propos'd. If by any other, who either held the same pretended Errors or others as ill, answer the same Difficulties proportionably. And if you will pretend to draw out the old rusty Distinction of *Points Fundamental* and *not Fundamental*, Pray tell us *First*, what you mean by *Fundamental*, and *2dly*, which *Points* precisely are to be esteem'd *Fundamental*, if you can: And if you cannot, confess that you cannot. If you will proceed in this manner, a few Lines may make a full Answer, and a few Days put an end to the Question: If you will not, or will not do it soon, I desire you will send back the Papers to the Place from whence you had them, for I am going out of Town very soon.

I am, Sir, tho' unknown,

Your Well-wisher and Servant,

A. B.

April the 5th, 1704.

SIR,

YOUR anonymous Letter, dated the 2d Instant, I received Yesterday towards the Evening, when some Gentlemen were with me, who came to make me a charitable Visit, having heard I was not well. In it you sent me a Question to Answer, which you call a *Thread-bare* Question, *viz. By what Linage do you make good your*

your descent from the fourth Century to the pretended Reformation? I suppose by *your descent*, you mean either the Descent or Succession of our Doctrines, or the Descent or Succession of our Bishops and Priests; or it may be both, for by the uncertainty of the Terms, in which you put your Question, I am left to guess at your Meaning. If by *your Descent*, you mean the Descent of our Doctrines, I answer, that they have descended to us from the end of the fourth Century, as they did from the third Century to the end of the fourth, and from the second to the end of third, and from the first to the end of the second, from Christ and his Apostles, through a continued Succession of Oriental and Occidental Churches to the Time of the Reformation; only with this Difference, that they descended through the first four Centuries pure and without erroneous Additions and Mixtures, but afterwards were conveyed down with Errors and Innovations, at first fewer and of less Moment, then by degrees more and greater (especially in the *Latin Church*.) And the Church of *England* by the Reformation separated the pure and primitive Doctrines, from those impure Additions, which were not primitive: She separated the Wheat from the Chaff, the Gold from the Dross; and the Doctrines, I mean the positive Doctrines, which you hold with us, you cannot, you dare not deny to be primitive and pure. And this Answer, as to Substance, hath been made 150 Years ago, and hath never been confuted. But if by *your Descent*, you mean the Descent or Succession of our Bishops and Priests, I answer, that we have as good a Succession of Bishops and Priests, as the *Roman Church* hath this Day, or had at the time of the Reformation. A Succession derived through seventeen Centuries from the Apostles and

their next Successors, by continued Consecrations and Ordinations, of which we have most certain Evidence and Records from the beginning of the Reformation, as hath been often shew'd to the World.

I have now, Sir, sent you an Answer to your Question, or rather Questions; for if by *your Descent*, you meant both the Descent of our Doctrines and of our Bishops and Priests, it was *fallacia plurium interrogationum*, and not one Question, but two. But be it as you please, one or two Questions, as in Compliance with your Request, I have returned a plain Answer to it: So I hope, in requital, you will be so kind, as to return me as plain an Answer to those which follow in your own Terms.

By what Linage do you make good the Descent of Transubstantiation, through the first five Centuries to the sixth?

By what Linage do you make good the Pope's Supremacy over the Universal Church through the same Centuries?

Shew me the Descent of the first Doctrine, if you can, through the first five Centuries against *Albertinus* in his three Books in one Volume, *de Eucharistie Sacramento*, printed MDCLV.

Shew me, if you can, the Descent of the second Doctrine through the same Ages against one of your learned Writers, *Lambert*, in his Preface to the French Translation of St. Cyprian's Epistles, and *Launoy*, and others, and one of ours Dr. *Barrow*, in his Book against the Pope's Supremacy.

If the Linage or Descent of these Doctrines cannot be proved through those Ages, *i. e.* from Christ and his Apostles to the beginning of the sixth Century, it will be no matter of Triumph to your Church to shew their Original many Ages after; nor can any Christian be obliged to be of a Church, which

which imposes Doctrines under *Anathema's* as true and catholick Doctrines, and necessarily to be believed in order to Salvation, if they cannot be made good or authenticated from that Descent.

I might ask the same Question concerning all the Doctrines in dispute between you and us, which we deny to be Pure, Primitive, or Catholick, whose *Linage* it lies upon you to make good through the foresaid Ages.

As to the Distinction (which you think decent to call the *old rusty Distinction*) of *Points Fundamental and not Fundamental*, it is you, Sir, to use your own Words, *who draw it out*, and not I, who as yet have had no occasion for it. But as rusty as you are pleased to think it, you may find it polished in Answers to your two Questions, by Mr. *Chillingworth*, to whom in 50 Years Time there has been made no substantial satisfactory Answer.

As to your Papers, which you desire me to send back to the Person from whom I had them, *if I will not answer them or answer them soon*; I told Mr. G——n when he brought them, I would, God willing, certainly answer them. He found me removing when he brought them, which as I remember, was last *Wednesday* Sevensnight. Last *Saturday* he came to tell me, that you were speedily to go out of Town, and that you desired a speedy Answer; I reply'd that you pretended so a Month ago, but were here still; that the Controversy was now between you and me without any farther regard to his Sister; that if you went out of Town, my Answer might be sent to you in any part of *Europe*; that I was not well; that I had a great deal of other Work, the World knew of, upon my Hands; that I was an infirm Man (and now I will add, an Old Man who hath no *Amanuensis*) but that by God's Assistance I would certainly answer

swer your Papers ; and so I now tell you, that I will answer them by God's help with the first Con-
 veniency and opportunity of Health and Leisure, though you are pleased to intimate in a very plain manner, that I have declined to answer them, because of the Difficulries proposed in them. But I assure you, Sir, I do not think it difficult at all to make an Answer to them ; though to use the words of your Letter, *being full of superfluous Words, Digressions, and Artifices to prolong the Dispute*, it will require much labour of writing to answer them, which I, who am attended with so great Infirmities of Body, cannot easily endure : But in no respect else will it be difficult for me to make an Answer to them ; and therefore, Sir, I must beg your Excuse, that I do not send them back. No, Sir, I'll keep them in Memory of you, though I know not who you are. I'll keep them also, because I do not know what occasion I may have to produce them ; and for the same reasons, I doubt not but you'll keep mine, and so I wish you to do.

Sir, when you write next, I pray you to write with more Care, and perspicuity, and propriety of expression, as becomes a controversial writer ; and as you are a Divine, I will also beg leave to put you in remembrance, that it becomes you to write with more Gravity, and in a more modest Stile, and with more Respect to your Adversaries, in Controversy with whom you are or may be engaged. Sir, I offer this Advice in general, rather than in particular as to my self (whom you may treat in any manner you think fit) that in case your Papers at any time should come to be published, nothing may be found in them unsuitable to those Characters, which may expose you to the just Censure of learned, and sober, and judicious Men, of what Religion soever they be.

These

These Rules of writing Controversy, of which I presume to put you in mind, I shall in the whole Progress of what shall pass between us take care to remember my self, and to shew my self in all Offices of Christian Charity

Your faithful Friend

and Servant,

GEO. HICKES.

April

April the 10th.

S I R,

UPON the 8th of this, in the Evening, I receiv'd yours of the 5th, in answer to a few Lines I had writ to you on the 2d, to press you, if I could, to return an Answer to my former Paper, that I might have Time to reply to yours, before my departure out of Town. The whole drift of the Letter, and the terms of the Question, to which you have endeavour'd to return an Answer, methinks might have inform'd you, that I had no design to put a new Question to you, to be answer'd separately ; but to urge you to return an Answer to the former. In reference to which former Question, the new one was made so short, as compendiating in it the sense of the former Query in other Words, and as being there more fully explain'd. For having there formerly ask'd you to shew me the *Protestant Church for 900 or 1000 Years before the pretended Reformation, your Bishops, Congregations, &c.* it seems to follow clearly (this Question being put in reference to the former) that when I ask'd you now, *How you make good your Descent for so many Ages,* you ought to understand it of the Succession of your Church, Bishops, Congregations teaching and believing your Doctrines. So that I neither mean your Doctrine only, nor your Bishops and Priests only ; but a Succession of faithful Men, including both Pastors and Flock, such as may be call'd a Church, teaching and believing the Articles of the Church of *England*. And this my meaning I thought I had sufficiently explain'd, in my Answer to your Exceptions against my

my other Query. Besides that, the Question being about the Indetectibility of the Church, it ought to be supposed that we enquire after the perpetuity of that, which both sides grant to be indefectible, to wit, the Church. And this seems to me to be the natural, clear, and necessary sense of my words, especially if they be taken, as they ought, with respect to the former Query. And though the Question taken in this sense, include *Bishops, Priests, People*, and the *Doctrine* they teach and hold, yet it is not, as you say, *Fallacia plurium interrogationum*; because the word Church, or Society, or Congregation, includes only the *Faithful, in recto* (as we say) and *the Doctrine believ'd, in obliquo*. As if I should ask some Jocky, whether he knew of any Breed of Horses, that had been mark'd with a Black-spot in the Face from Generation to Generation for this 300 Years: It would be no more than one Question for the same Reason.

And now, may not one suspect without Rashness, that you artificially mistook the state of the Question, as if I had not demanded a Succession of your Churches, but of some of your Doctrines which are common to both you and us? And which, no doubt, you may easily deduce successively down through the Occidental and Oriental Churches, But this is just nothing, and yet it is just all the Substance of your Answer.

For, 1st, You must shew the successive Tradition of those Doctrines not in our Church, not in the Eastern Church; but in a Protestant Church, in a Church holding the Articles of the Church of *England*: Otherwise you do not prove the perpetual Descent of your Church, but ours. And consequently, your Answer doth not so much as touch my Question.

2^{dly}, Your Answer is fitted for the defence of all Heresies, as well as your Church. You told us in
your

your last Paper (and the thing in it self is manifest) that there are several Protestant Churches, that are not true Churches. Now let us apply the words of your Answer to any of them; for Example, the Socinians, Quakers, &c. who held with us the *Unity and other Attributes of God, the Birth, Passion, Death, and Resurrection of Christ, &c.* Now, suppose these false Churches were urg'd with this Argument of the Perpetuity of the true Church, thus they might take up your words, and defend themselves in the same manner that you do: *Our Doctrines have descended to us from the Apostles, through a continued Succession of Oriental and Occidental Churches to the time of our Reformation; only with this difference, that, first, they were deliver'd pure to us, but afterwards mix'd with many Errours, which we separated from the pure and primitive Doctrines; and these Doctrines, I mean the positive Doctrines which you hold with us, you cannot, you dare not deny to be pure and primitive.* Behold your whole Answer in Substance, which you say has been made 150 Years ago, and never yet confuted. And yet it clearly confutes and destroys it self, as being a Defence for all the Hereticks, that ever went out of the Church, and consequently a false one; for no Truth can give Testimony to Falshood. Therefore you are desir'd to exhibit some other Answer in your defence, except you will be content to stay under the same roof with those, whom you confess to be false Churches.

I have, Sir, many other, as I think, just and important Exceptions against this your Answer: As, 1st, By what Rule you so assuredly know, that those Doctrines alone which you have retain'd, are requisite to the Constitution of a Church, wherein Salvation may be had, and that no other Points are
necessary

necessary to be believed? *2dly*, How can you escape the censure of an intolerable Presumption for a few Reformers at the beginning, and those not singular or eminent in Virtue or Learning, to pretend to understand the sense of Scriptures and Antiquity, and to know the universal Traditions of the Church, better than all the Eastern and Western Churches, that is, better than the universal Church, at least at the beginning of your Reformation, as you yourselves must confess; and in opposition to the whole World, to dare to separate as *Dross* and *Chaff* whatever Articles you thought fit to dislike? *3dly*, Supposing the Errors you pretend to spy, were truly so, how can you defend that they were not so grievous, as to destroy the very Being of a true Church? These and other Exceptions I could justly make against your Defence: But partly because it would draw me too far, partly because I think what I have already said to be sufficient, and partly because we shall have occasion to speak of some of 'em in your other Paper, which you promise; I think it convenient neither to trouble you nor myself with any more at present.

As to your Request, in which you desire me to make good the descent of Transubstantiation and the Pope's Supremacy through the first five Centuries; if it had been moderate and seasonable, I would willingly have comply'd with it. But since you desire me to make good the first against three Books of *Albertinus De Eucharistia Sacramento*, and the second against *Lambert, Launoy*, and *Dr. Barrow*, and others; I hope you will not take it ill, if I desire to be excus'd from answering in one Paper so many Volumes of two Subjects so different, especially being nothing (but a hinderance) to our present Controversy. I rather remit you to *Gualterus*
and

and * *Coccius*, who (if I remember well, for I have no Library by me) both of 'em deduce Proofs of both those Verities through all the Centuries. Tho' it may not be amiss to advertise you by the by, that we are not oblig'd to maintain the *Pope's Supremacy*, in your terms, *over the Universal Church*, collectively taken. For though it be much the more common, nay, almost general Opinion amongst our Divines,

* The Title of his Book in *Latin*, is *Thesaurus Catholicus*, Col. 1600, of which Dr. *Thomas James* writes thus in his *Mystery of the Indices Expurgatorii*. Lastly, You bring in multitudes of Writers, which have, and do daily witness (as you say) the Truth on your side, to prove your Unity, Universality, and Consent. Whom would it not amaze to see such a cloud of Witnesses and torrent of Writers, as *Coccius*, the great Book-master doth produce in every Question? But setting aside the *bastardy of the false*, and *corruption of the true*, your *Indices Expurgatorii*, your *Catalogue of Books forbidden*, your *see, see* in every Page, which is but a Bug-bear to fray Children withal, you shall see how naked and destitute you are of true Fathers, learned Schoolmen, or modern Writers; and that your *Coccius* (a Writer so much esteem'd by your younger Divines) was very much to blame to leave his Religion upon pretence of Authorities (as *Laurence Trivius* reports in his Preface to his first Tome) abounding on your side, and scarcely to be found in any Number on *ours*, as you teach Men to say. Accordingly, Doctor *James* hath shew'd almost in every Page of his *bastardy of the false Fathers*, how *Coccius* urges the Authority of spurious Fathers to prove the Popish Doctrines; particularly under the spurious Treatise of *Linus* Pope of Rome, *Jodocus Coccius* (saith he) the great Treasurer of such fabulous, erroneous, and counterfeit Stuff, urges the Authority of this Book in his first Tome for Apparitions of the Dead, and in Tome II. for *Peter's Supremacy*. Thus much I thought fit to observe of my Adversary's *Coccius*. And also to add, that it was answered in Latin by Mr. *William Perkins*, whose Answer was published after his Death in MDCIV. and dedicated to King *James I.* by Dr. *Sam. Ward*. And I refer my Adversary to this Answer. The Title of it is, *Guilielmi Perkinsii, problema de Romana fidei e mentito Catholicismo*.

yet

yet it is not *de fide*. Now, either you thought this was *de fide* with us, or that it was not. If you thought it was not, it seems incongruous in you to oblige me to defend it: If you thought it was, it was no less improper for you to call those Authors that writ against it, *our Authors*.

And now, Sir, since you say the Controversy is only betwixt you and me, and has no regard to the Person for whose sake it was begun, in the Name of God take all the leisure and conveniency you can desire. For it was purely upon that Person's account and my own departure out of Town, that I was willing to bring the sooner this Debate to some issue. I have much compassion for your Infirmities, and am very sensible of the trouble it is to you to write so much without help, by my own experience; and therefore I do not desire you should make yourself uneasy in the least, upon that account.

I must confess, that your resolution of retaining my Papers in *memory of me*, and because *you may have occasion to produce 'em*, as you say, a little surprizes me. I would not have you to think, Sir, that I was any way fond of entring into this Engagement, or that I was induc'd to undertake this business without some entreaty, and assurance that I should have to do with a Man of Honour, as I doubt not but I have. Therefore I do not believe that you will do any thing, which may render this Affair of greater Noise than is convenient for our Circumstances. This is what was assur'd me before I began, and this is what I expect from a Person of your Character.

You desire me hereafter to write with more *perspicuity* and *propriety of Expression*; which request of yours is too reasonable to be deny'd, if the meanness of my Talents, which I willingly acknowledge,

P

would

would let me comply with it. But really, Sir, I cannot in all the Dictionary find a word that expresses my meaning, better than the word *perish*; nor am I so acute as to spy out any ambiguity in these words *the Church of Christ*, having learn'd out of one of the Creeds that there is but *one Church*: And these and such like are the terms, in which you want *perspicuity* and *propriety* of Expression. Let our Papers decide this matter betwixt us. And now, Sir, with the like freedom, give me leave to tell you what I could desire in you; 1st, that having your Eyes open, you would be pleas'd to make use of 'em, and see; and, 2^{dly}, that you would be pleas'd to enter into the Matter in debate, and not *languish about Questions and Strifes of Words*: For you know very well, that of above a Sheet and a half which you have writ at twice, there is not above ten lines of an Answer.

As to your last Advice, I leave it to you to consider, whether it had not been as decent to have given it by your example, as in writing; and whether it had not been more modest and just to have given your Advice in such Terms as these: *Let us both hereafter write with more Gravity, and in a more modest Style, &c.* You may be pleas'd to call to memory, that when I had not yet writ above three lines in a Query, without any Offence given, you thought it modest to tell me, that I talk'd like one that *did not understand Controversy*, like a *new Convert*, like a *Novice* (that is, like a Fool) all in one Breath. Tho', I confess, I have writ with less Temper than either my Inclination or Principles exacted from me, purely lest a good Cause should be over-born by such big words as you made use of; yet in all my Papers you will not read such words, as those of yours. However, for the future (since you

you are so well dispos'd) I am resolv'd you shall never overcome me in Courtesy, nor in any Duties of Christian Charity, by which I may shew you the Esteem I have for a Person of your Worth and Learning; and I am,

S I R,

Your true Well-wisher, and humble Servant.

A. B.

April 24. 1704.

S I R,

TO your complex confus'd Question concerning the Descent of our Church a clear and distinct Answer was made, by distinguishing the different signification of the words, and answering separately to Senses really different; without which no Discourse is intelligible, no Question can be examin'd. 'Tis certain, that two Ideas and two Facts of a different Nature are neither one, nor of the same Nature; and this is evidently the case before us. Doctrine and Hierarchy are two distinct Ideas; and the descent or succession of Doctrine as a Fact, different from succession of Bishops and Churches. The Greek Church has undoubtedly succession of Bishops and Churches, but not of Doctrine. The Church of Rome which adher'd to the Antipopes during the Succession at Avignon, retain'd the Doctrine, but had not true Succession, if there is any difference between Popes and Antipopes. Thus these Notions and Facts are evidently distinct;

and therefore it was necessary to distinguish them, to give a clear Answer to the Question propos'd.

You acknowledge, you neither *mean our Doctrine only, nor our Bishops and Priests only*; then you comprehend both in the Question; and if Bishops and Doctrine are different, the Question is certainly *plurium interrogationum*; and 'tis impossible there should be such a Fallacy, if different Things or Notions were not comprehended in one single Question. You say *the word Church includes only the Faithful in Recto, and the Doctrine believ'd in Obliquo*. Whatever these Terms may signify, the Faithful cannot be considered without Faith, nor consequently without Doctrine; and it seems strange, that in your Reply you say something which is *just nothing* to the *Obliquo*, but not one word to the *Recto*. You object against our Doctrine, but not against our succession of Priests and Bishops.

You declare, the Question *includes Bishops, Priests, People, and Doctrine*; then 'tis plain it includes the whole Controversy, for Doctrine, and Communion, and Succession of both, contain all that can be comprehended in it. Thus your single Question is in effect the whole Controversy; and I take the liberty to match it with another. *What Proof is there of the Descent of the Romish Church from the Apostles to the present Age?* Will not this, as you understand *Church*, appear to be a complicated Question? You must shew the Origine of all your Doctrine; that Transubstantiation, Communion in one Kind, Invocation of Saints and Angels, Worship of Images, Prayers in a Tongue unknown, Supremacy of the Pope, and all the other controverted Doctrines defin'd in the Council of *Trent*, were taught by the Apostles; and that they have been always taught and believ'd from that Age to the present; that Popes, Bishops, Priests, particular Churches

Churches and Congregations, have for seventeen Centuries profess'd and practic'd them; and that they were true Popes, Bishops, and Priests, notwithstanding your own Doctrines concerning the Nullity of Sacraments.

THESE general Questions will produce a numerous Off-spring, and every Particular must be fully resolv'd, or else the Proof will be imperfect; so that 'tis evident, that one Question, exactly parallel to yours, does include the whole Controversy: And in fine, one Question may be propos'd (as that of *Pilate*, what is Truth?) which will contain all the Questions that ever were, or can be imagin'd: And as to your *Jocky*, you may ask him if you please, whether he cannot distinguish between the Race of his Horses and their Marks; if he has common sense, he can easily tell you, that the Race of his Horses may be without those Marks, and those Marks without that Race of Horses.

In the next Paragraph, you call distinguishing the Question, *artificially mistaking it*; and then you seem to be angry, and say with convenient Modesty, that *all the Substance of the Answer is just nothing*. 'Twas then a noble Atchievement of yours, to make a Reply to *Nothing*; but let this *Nothing* be examin'd: You meant, it seems, by the Descent of our Church, Succession, 1. Of Doctrine, 2. Of Pastors, 3. Of Congregations. It was answer'd, that all our positive Doctrines were descended from the Apostles, and that the Succession of our Bishops and Priests was derived from them: Nothing was said of Congregations, because it was not necessary, since it was obvious to understand, that our Pastors were never without a Flock; and that if a Succession of Bishops and Priests professing our negative Articles, is not necessary to be shewn, so neither of People or Congregations adhering to

P 3

them;

them: But tho' it is not necessary, yet for your better Satisfaction even that shall be consider'd also.

As to Doctrine, the Sum of the Answer was, that our positive Doctrines, or all that we believe, has been always believed in the Christian Church; this you own to be true, but add, that it is *just nothing*. Is it nothing then that our Faith is Catholick? And why is it nothing? *We must shew the successive Tradition of these Doctrines not in the Romish, not in the Eastern Church, but in a Protestant Church, in a Church holding all the Articles of the Church of England; that is, we must shew our positive Doctrine was believed in all the Ages of Christianity, in some particular Church, that has in all those Ages protested against Popery, and that has always held all the negative Articles of the Church of England, which renounce the Errors of Popery: A Demand apparently unreasonable, and contradictory to it self. For it is impossible, that Popery could be professed against in all Ages, if it was not always believ'd; or, that the Reformation of Errors should be more ancient, than the Errors reform'd: And it is absurd to demand, whether the Pastors and People of the Church of England protested against Errors before they protested; and fram'd Articles to renounce them, before they did renounce them: Yet this is the plain meaning of your Demand; and at this rate, 'tis easy to transubstantiate any thing into nothing.*

You may please therefore to descend out of the Clouds, and convince us, if you can, by solid Proof, that the Doctrines rejected in the *Articles of the Church of England*, are truly Catholick and Apostolick, and then we will reform our Articles; but if those Doctrines are incapable of such Proof, 'tis certain no Christian was ever oblig'd to believe them; and 'tis to no purpose to ask whether they were

were disbelieved sooner or later, since every Christian discerning their Falshood had at all times a right to renounce them.

The only Reason you give of that unreasonable Demand, to shew that our positive Doctrine was always taught in a Church denying your Errors, is that *otherwise we prove the Descent of your Church, not ours.* To which I answer: 1. That the Descent of our Doctrines is originally from the Scripture and Primitive Church, and that Descent belongs not to your Church, as distinguish'd by your Doctrine from ours: 2. Those Doctrines were convey'd down successively in all Catholick Churches, which proves the Descent of our Church, as to Doctrine, because it contains all that we believe to be essential; but not of yours, because you believe many other Doctrines to be alike essential, and the Descent of a part does not prove the Descent of all your Doctrine. 3. The perpetuity of a particular Church, *Greek, or Roman, English, or American,* is not necessary to be prov'd. 4. To shew that a particular Church is a true Member of the Catholick, it suffices to shew that it has true Pastors and all Catholick Doctrines howsoever convey'd. 5. A Church may be descended from the Apostles, whose negative Doctrines were but of yesterday; therefore they are nothing to the Descent of Churches.

BUT since you will comprehend Congregations in the Descent of Churches, to prevent all complaint of Tergiversation, I answer directly, that there were not any particular Churches or Congregations explicitly professing all the Articles of the Church of *England*, before they were fram'd at the Reformation. And if you will make advantage of the Concession against our Church, 'tis necessary, first, to justify your own, and to prove that all the Articles positive and negative defin'd in the Council of *Trent*,

younger than the Reformation, were explicitly taught and believ'd by Christian Congregations, successively from the time of the Apostles to that Council ; for, if any one of those Articles was not perpetually profess'd, then there was not perpetual Succession of all your Doctrines; and because you pretend to be *the Catholick Church*, this Succession should be prov'd to be also Catholick. But you may confine your self to prove it in the particular Church of *Rome*, from the time of St. *Peter* to *Pius IV.* by continual explicit Confessions of that Church, or other Proof equivalent. But if this will cost too much labour, why are Questions propos'd which necessarily require it? And, what service is it to Religion, if by Argument you destroy your Church, and ours, and all the Churches of *Christendom*?

To justify and preserve our Church, 'tis sufficient to shew, that there was just Cause and lawful Authority to reform; and if so, the Reformation is justify'd; nor can it be condemn'd, because it began no sooner.

To return now to the *Answer*: You object against it, that it is *fitted for the Defence of all Heresies*. The Sum of it is this, That our Church holds all Catholick Doctrines, has rejected none, and has a true Succession of Pastors; and that this Answer is fitted to all Heresies, is inconceivable. Hereticks may make use of this Plea, and Murtherers may plead not guilty as well as the Innocent, but not with Truth: Nor is it possible, that he who believes all Catholick Doctrines can be a Heretick; nor is any one a Heretick, who is ready to believe any Catholick Doctrine, when propos'd sufficiently; nor is a good Answer a bad one, if Hereticks use it without any right to it.

The

The only Hereticks you mention, are *Socinians and Quakers*, who hold with us the *Unity and other Attributes of God, the Birth, Passion, Death, and Resurrection of Christ*; in which you are mistaken; for the *Socinians* do not hold God's Omniscience, as to future Contingencies, and the *Quakers* do not believe the Truth of the Birth, Death, and Resurrection of Christ. But whatever their Errors are, you apply to them this Defence: *Our Doctrines have descended to us from the Apostles, through a continual Succession of Oriental and Occidental Churches, pure for a time, afterward mix'd with Errors, which we separated from the pure and primitive Doctrines; and these you hold with us, and cannot deny to be pure and primitive: And then you triumph, and affirm, that this is a Defence for all Hereticks, and consequently a false one; for no Truth can give Testimony to Falshood: But this is just nothing, and yet 'tis just all the Substance of your Answer.* For,

1. If the *Socinians* and *Quakers* do hold all Doctrines, that are *pure, and primitive*, and truly Catholick, then they are no Hereticks; and if they have a true succession of Pastors, then their Churches are truly Catholick also, unless they have made a causeless separation from other Churches.
2. If they do not really hold all Doctrines that are truly Catholick, if they have rejected any such under pretence of Reforming, then they have no right to that Defence; and,
3. If they use a Defence they have no right to, or you use it for them, it does not follow that *Truth gives Testimony to Falshood*, for their Defence is not Truth.
4. Tho' you or others abuse this Defence, yet 'tis a good Defence for our Church, if 'tis true, that she holds all Catholick Doctrines, and has rejected nothing but Errors.
- Therefore 5. You must prove, if it is possible,

possible, that the Church of *England* has rejected any one Catholick Doctrine ; and 6. There is no Plea whatsoever, which has not been apply'd to the defence of Errors : As for instance, Scripture, by the *Manichees* ; Inspiration, by the *Montanists* ; Tradition, by the *Millenaries* ; Succession of Doctrine and Churches, by the *Graeks* ; General Councils, by the *Arians* ; and in fine, the Infallibility of Popes and Councils, for the damnable Doctrine of deposing Princes : And therefore if you will go about to justify your Faith, you must neither make use of Scripture, nor divine Inspiration, nor Tradition, nor Succession, nor of the Authority of Popes and Councils, nor yet farther of *your Reason* ; for every one of these has been the defence of Hereticks and Schismaticks, and *consequently a false one, for no Truth can give Testimony to Falshood* . If you say, Those Defences have been falsly apply'd, so say we of your Defence of Quakers and Soci-nians.

You pretend you have *other just and important exceptions against the Answer* ; three are offered, and more are kept *in petto*, which, when they are known, will be also consider'd.

To the first Exception or Question I answer, That we are sure our Church has retain'd all things necessary to Salvation, because it has retain'd the Scripture, the ancient Creeds, and whatever was thought necessary to the Constitution of a Church in primitive Christianity ; and we are sure no other points are necessary, because it is impossible to prove them to be so.

To your second complicated Question I answer separately, That there is no possibility of escaping the Censure of Parties. That 'tis no presumption, if *Athanasius* is *contra Mundum*. That the Reformers were as eminent for Virtue and Learning,

as

as any of that Age. They agreed with all the *Eastern* Churches in rejecting the Pope's Supremacy, which is the fundamental point of Popery, as one Communion. That neither the *Eastern* nor *Western* Church was infallible. That where-ever the Reformers found Errors, they had a right to reject them. That the *English* Reformers were as capable of understanding Scripture, Antiquity, and Tradition, as Pope *Paul III.* or any Council of *Italian* Prelates, tho' joyn'd with a few *French* and *Spaniards*. When the Controversy is examin'd impartially, it will appear they understood them better. Their Judgment was and is approved by Millions of Christians. Lastly, When they separated the Dross and Chaff, they had reason to do it; and it is not true, that the whole World did oppose them.

To the third Question, supposing the Errors we pretend to spy, were truly so, how we can defend, that they were not so grievous as to destroy the very Being of a true Church? I answer in short, that we can prove it by the same way of reasoning, as you can prove, that the Corruptions and Depravations of a religious Order, when very grievous, do not destroy the Being of the Order, tho' they require a reformation of it; we can also prove it by the same way, that we can prove the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of *Israel*, which were very grievous, not to have destroyed the Being thereof. This hath often been proved, and the proof of it will be undertaken for your sake in the reply to the answer you expect.

Having perused your Papers, I find nothing in them but general *Cavils*, *Objections*, and *Questions*, which have been answered a thousand times; you propose and repeat them without adding any new force, and take no notice of the answers: At this rate the Controversy will be endless; and when we have

have gone over all the Arguments, Answers, Replies, and Rejoinders, that have been made since the beginning of this Controversy, it will be just as it was, and all the common places will be exhausted, without advancing one step towards the finishing of it. If you have any new demonstrative proof for any point of your Religion, 'tis worth while to produce it, for it may convert the Nation ; but as to the old Arguments in print, there are Answers in print, and it will be lost labour to transcribe them: But to lessen our Labour, if you will produce any one single Argument, be it old or new, for Transubstantiation, I will propose another against it, and so let the strength of them be try'd by a full Examination.

The proof of that point and of the Pope's Supremacy was required of you, because they are essential points in your Religion. Transubstantiation is the foundation of your Mass, and your Church is distinguish'd from all other Christian Churches by adherence to the Pope, as supreme Head of it. And it was surely moderate and reasonable to desire proof of the succession of two Doctrines, from one, who demands proof of the descent of our Church, including therein succession of Pastors, Congregations, and all our negative, as well as positive Doctrines. You were referr'd to *Albertinus* and *Barrow* (who, I am sure, wrote since *Coccinus* and *Gualterus*, though I never saw this latter Writer) not because it was thought possible for you to answer them, but because we think them to be unanswerable: And if succession of Churches, including all Doctrines, is the subject of your *present Controversy*, then 'tis evident you are oblig'd to make good the perpetual succession of all your own Doctrines, and especially of those that do principally constitute your Church and Worship.

You

You add an Advertisement very unnecessary^r That you are not oblig'd to maintain the Pope's Supremacy *over the Universal Church collectively taken*. Your distinction between the Church collective and diffusive was sufficiently known, and that many of your Doctors deny the Pope's Authority to be superiour to a General Council. However in requital, I will advertise you likewise of what you know already, that the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil* have defin'd the superiority of Councils; that the *Gallican* Church has constantly maintain'd it; and that apparently *Aeneas Sylvius* gave the true reason, why it became *the more common Opinion*, that the Pope is above a Council, which was *because Popes did give Bishopricks and Archbishopricks, but Councils gave none*; and therefore 'tis no wonder, if it is true as you say, that this *Opinion is almost General amongst your Divines*; yet you add, that it is not *de fide*. You know however, that both Opinions have been taught to be *de fide*, and that by great Authorities; and this is true also as to the Pope's Authority of deposing Princes, one Party has affirm'd it to be *de fide*, and the other has deny'd it; and this seems to be an evident proof that Infallibility does not make you agree in what is infallibly defin'd or not. That you are uncertain in points fundamental to Church, and Civil Government, that you have no certain Rule to know what is *de fide*; and that 'tis as hard for you, as for Protestants, to define what is fundamental, or to determine the number of all your Articles of Faith, whether written Verities, or unwritten Traditions, or Church Definitions. And of this Uncertainty we have had lately a singular instance at *Rome*, where your infallible Judge resides, if there is any such thing at present. The Jesuits of *China* were accused of Idolatry for their
pro-

prostrations before the Picture or Statue of *Confusus*. The Fact was certain, the Dispute was, whether it was Idolatry ; and that, if any thing, might be easily determin'd by Infallibility. But the Infal-
 lible Judge referr'd it to a Congregation of Cardinals, and there the process depended a long while, and I know not yet whether it is finally decided.

The Writings of *Lambert* and *Launoy* being cited against the Pope's Supremacy : You ask whether *it was thought to be de fide or not ?* Now if his Supremacy over the Church collective, which is but a part of the Church, is not *de fide*, I desire to know if it is *de fide* that he is Supreme over the whole Church or the Church diffusive ? But agree that among your selves. If his Supremacy is not *de fide*, 'tis certain *you are not obliged to defend it*, nor any one to believe it, which is all that we desire : And if it was thought to be *de fide*, then say you *it was improper, to call Authors that writ against it your Authors*. They were yours, because they lived and dyed in your Communion ; and if you will deny all those Authors to be yours, who have wrote any thing against any part of your Doctrine, then the number of your Authors will be much diminished ; and if you will disown them all, content, provided you will consider their Arguments, and never urge the Testimony of any Authors against us. I will add however the ingenuous Confession of *Erasmus*, and you may disown him likewise. *Non desunt Magni Theologi, qui non verentur affirmare, nihil esse in Luthero, quin per probatos Autores defendi possit.* *Erasm. Ep. lib. 15. Ep. ad Godeschalcum*, if I remember right.

I have omitted nothing that seem'd material in your Letter ; if you *languish about Questions and strifes of words* 'tis your own fault, and you may avoid it by producing Arguments.

Sir

Sir, When your Letter of the 10th instant was brought to me, the nearest Relation I had in my Family was very sick and full of Pains, and still continues bedrid. The care and compassion I had for a Person so near and dear to me, would not permit me to write an answer; for which reason I desired a Friend, that came to make me a visit, to draw up this, which I send you, as my own. He hath not meddled with any thing personal in your Letter, because he thought not the merits of the Controversy concerned in it. But perhaps I may think my self oblig'd to take some notice of it in my Answer to your Reply, which I am sorry for want of leisure is still owing to you. But I hope in a little time to send it. In the interim I must beg your forbearance, and remain, Sir,

Your faithful Friend

and Servant,

GEO. HICKES. •

F I N I S.

THE
CORRUPTIONS
OF THE
Church of *R O M E*,
In relation to
Ecclesiastical Government,
THE
RULE of FAITH, and FORM of
DIVINE WORSHIP:
IN
A N S W E R
TO THE
Bishop of *M E A U X*'s
Q U E R I E S,
B Y
The Reverend Dr. *BULL*.

The Third Edition.

L O N D O N :
Printed for RICHARD SARE. 1714.



A LETTER of Monsieur de Meaux's to Robert Nelson Esq; upon his having read Dr. Bull's Book, entituled [*Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Trium Primorum Seculorum de Necessitate credendi, quòd Dominus noster Jesus Christus sit verus Deus.*] presented to him by that worthy Gentleman.

A Monsieur Monsieur Nelson, à Blackheath.



A St. Germain en Laye, 24 Juil. 1700.

J'AY receu, Monsieur, depuis quinze jours une Lettre, dont vous m'honorez de *Blackheath* auprès de *Londres*, le 18 *Juillet* de l'année passée en m'envoyant un Livre du Docteur *Bullus*, entitulé, *Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, &c. Je vous dirai d'abord, Monsieur, que je ressentis beaucoup de joie à la veüe de vostre écriture & de vostre nom, & que je fus ravi de cette marque de vostre souvenir. Quant à l'Ouvrage du Docteur *Bullus*, j'ay voulu le lire entier, avant que de vous en accuser la reception; afin de vous en dire mon sentiment. Il est

Q 2

admirable

admirable, & la matiere qu'il traite ne pouvoit estre expliquée plus s'avamment & plus à fond. C'est ce que je vous supplie de vouloir bien luy faire savor, & en mesme temps les sinceres congratulations de tout le Clergé de *France* assemblé en cette Ville, pour le service qu'il rend à l'Eglise Catholique en defendant si bien le jugement quelle a porté sur la necessité de croire la divinité du Fils de Dieu. Qu'il me soit permis de luy dire qu'il me reste un seul sujet d'étonnement: C'est qu'un si grand homme qui parle si bien de l'Eglise, du salut que l'on ne trouve qu'en son unité, & de l'assistance infallible du St. Esprit dans le Concile de *Nicée*, ce qui induit la mesme grace pour tous les autres assemblez dans la mesme Eglise, puisse demeurer un seul moment sans la reconnoistre. Ou bien, Monsieur, qu'il daigne me dire comme à un zélé défenseur de la Doctrine qu'il enseigne, ce que c'est donc qu'il entend par ce mot *Eglise Catholique*? Estce l'Eglise *Romaine*, & celles qui luy adherent? Estce l'Eglise *Anglicane*? Estce un amas confus de Societez separées les unes des autres? Et comment peuvent elles estre ce Royaume de J. C. non divisé en luy mesme, & qui aussi ne doit jamais perir? Que je serai consolé d'avoir sur ce sujet un mot de response, qui m'explique le sentiment d'un si grave Auteur. Je suis tres aisé Monsieur d'attendre dans vostre Lettre l'heureuses nouvelles de la santé de Madame vostre Femme, que je recommande de bon cœur à Dieu avec vous & vostre Famille. Ceux qui vous ont raconté les rares talens de M. l'Archevesque de *Paris* aujourd 'huy le Cardinal de *Noailles*, vous ont dit la verité, il y a long temps que la chaire de St. *Denis* n'a esté si dignement remplie. Si M. *Collier* dont vous me parlez, a fait quelque écrit Latin sur la nouvelle Spiritualité,

vous

vous m'obligerez de me l'envoyer. Mais sur tout n'oubliez jamais, que je suis avec beaucoup de sincérité

Monsieur,

Vostre tres humble &

tres-obeissant Serviteur,

✠ J. Benigne, E. de Meaux.

To Mr. Nelson at Blackheath.

St. Germain en Laye, 24 July, 1700.

I Received, Sir, about a fortnight ago the honour of your Letter from *Blackbeath*, near *London*, dated the 18th of *July* of the last Year, when at the same time you sent me Dr. *Bull's* Book entituled, *Judicium Ecclesiae Catholicae, &c.* I must first, Sir, acquaint you, that the sight of your Hand and Name gave me a great deal of Joy, and that I was extremely pleased with this testimony of your remembrance. As to Dr. *Bull's* performance, I was willing to read it all over before I

Q 3

ackow-

acknowledged the receipt of it, that I might be able to give you my sense of it. 'Tis admirable, and the matter he treats could not be explained with greater Learning and greater Judgement. This is what I desire you would be pleased to acquaint him with, and at the same time with the unfeigned Congratulations of all the Clergy of *France*, assembled in this Place, for the Service he does the Catholick Church in so well defending her Determination of the necessity of believing the Divinity of the Son of God. Give me leave to acquaint him, there is one thing I wonder at, which is, that so great a Man, who speaks so advantageously of the Church, of Salvation which is obtain'd only in Unity with her, and of the infallible Assistance of the Holy Ghost in the Council of *Nice*, which infers the same Assistance for all others assembled in in the same Church, can continue a Moment without acknowledging her. Or either, Sir, let him vouchsafe to tell me, who am a zealous Defender of the Doctrine he teaches, what it is he means by the Term *Catholick Church*? Is it the Church of *Rome*, and those that adhere to her? Is it the Church of *England*? Is it a confus'd heap of Societies separated the one from the other? And how can they be that Kingdom of Christ not divided against it self, and which never shall perish? It would be a great satisfaction to me to receive some answer upon this Subject, that might explain the Opinion of so weighty and solid an Author. I very much rejoice at the good News you send me of your Lady's welfare, whom I heartily pray for with you and your Family. You have been rightly inform'd in the account you have receiv'd of the admirable Qualifications of the *Arch-Bishop* of *Paris*, now *Cardinal de Noailles*; the See of *St. Denis* has not for

for a long time been so worthily filled. If Mr. Collier, whom you mention, has writ any thing in *Latin* concerning the *modern mystical Divinity*, you will oblige me in conveying it to me. But above all remember, that I am with a great deal of Sincerity,

S I R,

Your most humble and

most obedient Servant,

✠ J. Benigne, *Bishop of Meaux.*

Dr. *BULL*'s Answer.

Sect. I. **T**HE approbation of my Writings by so learned and illustrious a Prelate as Monsieur *de Meaux*, especially when join'd with the Congratulations of the learned *Clergy* of *France* in general, is so high an Honour done me, that if I did not set a great value on it, I were altogether unworthy of it.

But as to the Wonder of Monsieur *de Meaux*, I cannot but very much wonder at it, especially at the Reasons on which it is grounded. He wonders *how I that speak so advantageously of the Church, &c. can continue a moment without acknowledging her.* Her! What her doth the Bishop mean? Doubtless the present Church of *Rome*, in the Communion whereof he himself lives, and to which his design seems to be to invite me. But where do I speak so advantageously of the present Church of *Rome*? No where, I am sure. My Thoughts concerning her, I have plainly (perhaps too plainly and bluntly in the Opinion of Monsieur *de Meaux*) deliver'd in the Book which he so commends. *Jud. Eccl. Cathol. cap. 5. §. 3.* where having spoken of that singular Purity of the Faith, which was in the Church of *Rome* in the first Ages, and taken Notice of, and extoll'd by some of the Primitive Fathers, I thus conclude,
 “ Oh

“ * Oh that so great a Happiness, such Purity of
 “ Faith had always continued in that Church! But,
 “ alas! We may now cry out in the holy Prophet’s
 “ words, *How is the faithful City become an Har-*
 “ *lot?*”

But Monsieur *de Meaux* seems to think the Ro-
 man and the Catholick Church to be convertible
 Terms, which is strange in so learned a Man, espe-
 cially at this time of the Day. Cannot the Catho-
 lick Church be mention’d, but presently the Roman
 Church must be understood? The Book which the
 Bishop refers to, bears this Title, *Judicium Ecclesie*
Catholicæ trium primorum seculorum, &c. Of the
 Catholick Church of the three first Centuries, I do in-
 deed speak with great deference. To her Judgment
 (next to the Holy Scriptures) I appeal against the
 oppugners of our Lord’s Divinity, at this Day,
 whether *Arians* or *Socinians*. The Rule of Faith,
 the Symbols or Creeds, the Profession whereof was
 in those Ages the condition of Communion with
 the Catholick Church (mention’d by *Irenæus*, *Ter-*
tullian, and others) I heartily and firmly believe.
 This *Primitive Catholick Church*, as to her Govern-
 ment and Discipline, her Doctrines of Faith, and
 her Worship of God, I think ought to be the Stand-
 ard, by which we are to judge of the Orthodoxy
 and Purity of all other succeeding Churches, ac-
 cording to that excellent Rule of *Tertullian de Pre-*
script. adv. Hæres. cap. xx, xxi. “ † Every De-
 “ scent

* *Utinam hac felicitas, hac fidei puritas Ecclesia isti perpe-*
tua fuisset! Sed proh dolor! Nunc propheta divini verbis ex-
clamare possumus, (Isa. 1. & 21.) Quomodo effecta est meretricis
Urbs fidelis?

† *Omne genus ad originem suam censeatur necesse est. Si hæc*
vera sunt, constat proinde omnem Doctrinam qua cum illis Eccle-
siis Apostolicis, matricibus, & originalibus fidei conspiraret, veri-
tati

" scent must necessarily deduce it self from its first
 " Original. If these things are true, it is plain
 " that every Doctrine which these Apostolical,
 " these Original and Mother-Churches held as ana-
 " logous to the Rule of Faith, is to be owned as
 " true, and as containing without doubt what the
 " Churches received from the Apostles, the Apo-
 " stles from Christ, Christ from God; but that all
 " other Doctrine is to be looked upon as false, and
 " no ways favouring of those Truths which have
 " been delivered by the Churches, and the Apo-
 " stles, and Christ, and God. And to the same
 purpose he discourseth, *cap. 31. ejusdem Libri.*

According to this Rule, the Church of England
 will be found the best and purest Church at this
 Day in the Christian World. Upon which account,
 I bless God that I was born, baptized, and bred up
 in her Communion; wherein I firmly resolve by his
 Grace to persist, *usque ad extremum vite spiritum.*
 How far the present Church of Rome hath departed
 from this Primitive Pattern, will appear hereafter.

Monsieur de Meaux adds as a farther Reason of
 his Wonder, *that I speak of Salvation as only to be
 found in unity with her.* Her! Doth the Bishop
 here again mean the present Church of Rome? If
 he doth, I must plainly tell him, that I am so far
 from ever thinking that Salvation is only to be found
 in unity with her, that on the contrary I verily be-
 lieve they are in great Danger of their Salvation
 who live in her Communion, that is, who own her
 erroneous Doctrines, and join in her corrupt Wor-
 ship, of which I shall give a large account before I

*tati deputandam, id sine dubio tenentem, quod Ecclesia ab Apo-
 stolis, Apostoli à Christo, Christus à Deo suscepit: Reliquam verè
 omnem Doctrinam de mendacio præjudicandam, qua sapiat contra
 veritatem Ecclesiarum, & Apostolorum, & Christi, & Dei.*

have

have done. I do indeed in the Book, which the Bishop hath an Eye unto, shew, that there was a Canon or Rule of Faith received in the Primitive Church, which whoever in any Point thereof denied or opposed, was judged an Heretick; and if he persisted in his Heresy, cast out of the Communion of the Catholick Church, and so out of the ordinary way of Salvation. But what is this to the present Church of Rome and her Communion?

The Bishop's last Reason is, *that I own the infallible Assistance of the Holy Ghost in the Council of Nice, which infers the same Assistance for all others assembled in the same Church.* To which I answer; I mention this indeed as the Opinion of Socrates, but at the same time, I give another account of the Credit that is to be given to the determination of the Nicene Council in the Article of our Saviour's Divinity, in the *Proemium* of my *Defensio Fidei Nicenæ*, §. 3. where my words are these: * “ But

* *Idem verò Socrates ejusdem Libri, Cap. ix. reprehendit Sabinum quòd non etiam secum reputaverit, ὅς ἐστι καὶ ἰδιώτης καὶ οἱ τὸ σωθῆναι, καὶ ἡ ἀμνηστία τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ τὸ χεῖρον τῶν ἀγίων ἀνδρῶν καὶ ἰσαμῶν ἀποχρῆσαι τὸ ἀληθὲς εἰδέναι.*
i. e. Eos qui ad Synodum illam convenerant, quamvis rudes essent & imperiti, à Deo vero & Spiritus S. gratia illustratos, nullatenus à veritate aberrare potuisse. Quippe sensisse videtur Socrates, Concilio Episcoporum verè universali semper adesse Spiritus Sancti gratiam illuminatricem, qua ipsos ab errore, saltem in necessariis fidei Articulis, liberos custodiat. Quam hypotesin si quis nolit admittere, poterit ad ipsum argumentationis Socratis ita institui & formari: Patres Niceni ut imperiti & literarum rudes fuisse fingantur, pii tamen certè maximam partem fuisse; incredibile autem est tot viros sanctos & probatos, ex omnibus orbis Christiani regionibus convenientes (qui qualicumque aliàs imperitià laboraverint, certè ignorare non poterant elementariam de SS. Trinitate Doctrinam, etiam Catechumenis tradi solitam, aut quid ipsi ea de re à majoribus accepissent,) nefarie conspirare potuisse ad hoc, ut receptam in Ecclesià fidem de primario Christianismi Articulo, innovarent.

“ the

“ the same *Socrates*, Chap. ix. of the same Book,
 “ reproves *Sabinus* for not considering with him-
 “ self, that they who came to this Council, how
 “ illiterate soever they were, yet being enlighten-
 “ ed by God and the Grace of the Holy Ghost,
 “ could in no wise depart from the Truth. For he
 “ seems to have thought the enlightning Grace of
 “ the Holy Ghost always to accompany a General
 “ Council of Bishops, and to preserve them from
 “ Error, especially in any of the necessary Articles
 “ of Faith. Which Supposition, if any one shall
 “ refuse to admit of, *Socrates’s* Argumentation
 “ may be thus directed and urged against him :
 “ The *Nicene Fathers*, let any imagine them as un-
 “ skilful and illiterate as he will, yet in the main
 “ were doubtless pious Men : But it is incredible
 “ that so many holy and approved Men, assembled
 “ from all Parts of the Christian World (who,
 “ how defective soever in any other sort of Know-
 “ ledge, could by no means be ignorant of the first
 “ and fundamental Doctrine of the Holy Trinity,
 “ a Doctrine wherein the very *Catechumens* were
 “ not uninstructed, or of what themselves had re-
 “ ceived from their Predecessors concerning it)
 “ should wickedly conspire amongst themselves to
 “ new model the Faith received in the Church, con-
 “ cerning this principal Article of Christianity.
 And indeed, all these things considered and laid to-
 gether, it was morally impossible, that the *Nicene*
 Fathers should have erred in the Determination of
 the Article before them. And that they did not
 actually err, I have sufficiently proved in the Bi-
 shop’s own Judgment, in the following Treatise.

But suppose I were fully of *Socrates’s* Opinion,
 concerning the infallible Assistance of the Holy
 Ghost attending every truly General Council in
 matters of Faith, I should be never the nearer to the
 the

the Communion of the *Church of Rome*, as it is now subjected to the Decrees of the *Trent Council*: For as I afterwards add in the same Preface, §. 8. † “The Assembly at *Trent* is to be called by any other Name, rather than that of a General Council.

I proceed to the Bishop's Questions: He asks me *what I mean by the Catholick Church?* I answer: What I mean by the *Catholick Church* in the Book which he all along refers to, I have already shewn, and the very Title of the Book sufficiently declares. If he asks me, what I mean by the Catholick Church, speaking of it as now it is? I answer; By the Catholick Church, I mean the Church Universal, being a Collection of all the Churches throughout the World, who retain * *the Faith* (*ἀπαξ*) *once delivered to the Saints*; that is, who hold and profess in the Substance of it, that Faith and Religion which was delivered by the Apostles of Christ to the first original Churches, according to *Tertullian's* Rule before-mention'd. Which Faith and Religion is contain'd in the Holy Scriptures, especially of the New Testament, and the main Fundamentals of it compriz'd in the Canon or Rule of Faith, universally received throughout the Primitive Churches, and the Profession thereof acknowledged to be a sufficient *testera* or *badge* of a Catholick Christian. All the Churches at this Day which hold and profess this Faith and Religion, however distant in place, or distinguish'd by different Rites and Ceremonies, yea, or divided in some extra-fundamental Points of Doctrine, yet agreeing in the Essentials of the Christian Religion;

† *Tridentina Conventio quidvis potius quàm Generale Concilium dicenda est.*

* *Judeiii.*

make

make up together one Christian Catholick Church under the Lord Christ, the supreme Head thereof. The Catholick Church under this Notion, is not *a confused heap of Societies separated one from another*. But it seems, no other Union of the Church will satisfy the Bishop, but a Union of all the Churches of Christ throughout the World under one visible Head, having a Jurisdiction over them all, and that Head the *Bishop of Rome* for the time being. But such a Union as this was never dream'd of amongst Christians for at least the first six hundred Years, as shall be shewn in its due place.

The Catholick Church, I believe, shall never totally fail; that is, Christianity shall never utterly perish from the Face of the Earth, but there shall be some to maintain and uphold it to the end of the World. Although some of the ancient Doctors of the Church have given us a very tragical Description of the state of the Universal Church of Christ, which shall be under the Reign of the great *Antichrist*. But I know of no Promise of Indefectibility from the Faith made to any particular Church, no, not to the *Church of Rome* it self. And if we may judge by the Holy Scriptures, and by the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Catholick Church, the present *Church of Rome* hath already lamentably fail'd, and fallen into many dangerous and gross Errors, as will by and by appear: Now that Church which hath already so far fail'd, why may she not utterly fail? If she be found but in one Error, the infallible direction of her Judgment, upon which her Indefectibility from the Faith must depend, is gone and destroy'd. I add, that divers eminent * Doctors, even of the

* *Ribera & Viera in Apoc. xvii.*

Roman Communion, have discover'd out of the *Apocalypse*, that *Rome* it self shall at length become the Seat of Antichrist. If so, where will the *Church of Rome* then be?

But I wonder why *Monfieur de Meaux* should ask me, whether by the Catholick Church I mean the *Church of Rome* or the *Church of England*? He knows full well, I mean neither the one nor the other. For to say either of the *Church of Rome*, or of the *Church of England*, or of the *Greek Church*, or of any other particular *Church* of what denomination soever, that it is the Catholick or Universal Church, would be as absurd as to affirm that a part is the whole. And to be sure I never meant the *Church of Rome* to be the Catholick Church exclusively to all other Churches. I am so far from any such meaning, that my constant judgment of the *Church of Rome* hath been, that if she may be allowed still to remain a *Part* or *Member* of the Catholick Church (which hath been questioned by some learned Men, upon Grounds and Reasons not very easy to be answer'd) yet she is certainly a very unsound and corrupted one, and sadly degenerated from her Primitive Purity. This I must insist upon, and have oblig'd my self to prove; and I prove it thus:

Sect. II. The *Church of Rome* hath quite altered the *Primitive Ecclesiastical Government*; changed the *Primitive Canon* or *Rule of Faith*, and miserably corrupted the *Primitive Liturgy* or *Form of Divine Worship*.

1st, She hath quite altered the *Primitive Ecclesiastical Government*, by erecting a Monarchy in the Church, and setting up her Bishop, as the universal Pastor and Governour of the whole Catholick Church,

Church, and making all other Bishops to be but his Vicars and Substitutes, as to their Jurisdiction.

For that the Bishop of *Rome* had no such universal Jurisdiction in the Primitive Times, is most evident from the sixth Canon of the first *Nicene* Council, occasioned, as it appears, by the Schism of *Meletius*, an ambitious Bishop in *Egypt*, who took upon him to ordain Bishops there, without the consent of the Metropolitan Bishop of *Alexandria*. The Words of the Canon are these: [† *Let the ancient Customs prevail, that are in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, That the Bishop of Alexandria have the Power over them all, for as much as the Bishop of Rome also hath the like custom. In like manner, in Antioch and all other Provinces, let the Privileges be preserved to the Churches.*] From this Canon it is plain, that the three Metropolitan Bishops or *Primates* (they were not as yet, I think, call'd *Patriarchs*) of *Alexandria*, *Rome*, and *Antioch*, had their distinct Jurisdictions, each independent on the other; and that all other chief Bishops or *Primates* of Provinces, had the same Privileges which are here confirm'd to them. It is true, this Canon doth not particularly describe or determine what the Bounds are of the *Roman* Bishop's Power, as neither doth it the Limits of the Bishop of *Antioch's* Jurisdiction, but only those of the Bishop of *Alexandria's* Province. The reason hereof is manifest, the case of the Bishop of *Alexandria* only was at this time laid before the Synod, whose Jurisdiction in *Egypt* had been lately invaded by the schismatical Ordinations of *Meletius*, as I before observ'd. But that the *Roman* Bishop's Power,

† Τα ἀρχαία ἔθνη νεγέστε.
Ephesin. Can. 8.

Vid. Apost. 34. & Conc.

as well as that of the other Metropolitans, had had its Bounds, is most manifest from the Example that is drawn from thence, for the Limits of other Churches. For what an absurd thing is it, that the Church of *Rome* should be made the Pattern for assigning the Limits to other Metropolitan Churches, if that Church also had not her known Limits at the same time when this Canon was made? Intolerable is the Exposition which *Bellarmin* and other Romanists give of these Words of the Canon; † *for as much as the Bishop of Rome also hath the like custom*; i. e. (they say,) “It was the custom of the Bishop of *Rome* to permit, or leave to the Bishop of *Alexandria* the Regimen of *Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis*. Certainly τὸ τοιοῦτον ὅτιν implies a like custom in the Church of *Alexandria*, and in the Church of *Rome*; and the sense of the Canon is most evident, that the Bishop of *Alexandria* should, according to the ancient custom of the Church (not by the permission of the *Roman* Bishop) enjoy the full Power in his Province, as by the like ancient custom the Bishop of *Rome* had the Jurisdiction of his. But they that would see this Canon fully explain’d and clear’d from all the trifling Cavils and Exceptions of the *Romanists*, may consult the large and copious Annotations of the learned Dr. *Beveridge*, Bishop of *St. Asaph*, upon it, where he will receive ample Satisfaction.

Thus was the Government of the Catholick Church in the Primitive Times distributed among the several chief Bishops or Primates of the Provinces, neither of them being accountable to the other, but all of them to an *Oecumenical* Council, which was then held to be the only supreme visible

† Ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῆ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπου τὸ τοιοῦτον ὅτιν.
R Julg

Judge of Controversies arising in the Church, and to have the Power of finally deciding them. Hence the Case of the Bishop of *Alexandria* before-mentioned, was not brought before the Bishop of *Rome* or any other Metropolitan, but refer'd to the Fathers of the *Nicene* Council to be finally determined by them.

The universal Pastorship or Government of the Catholick Church was never claim'd by any Bishop, till towards the end of the sixth *Century*, and then it was thought to be challenged by *John* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, assuming to himself the Title of *Oecumenical* or *Universal* Bishop; whom *Gregory* the Great, Bishop of *Rome*, vehemently oppos'd, pronouncing him the fore-runner of Antichrist, who durst usurp so arrogant a Title. And 'tis worthy observing how passionately the same *Gregory* expresseth his detestation of the Pride and Arrogance of the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*, in his Letter to *Mauritius* the Emperour: † “ I am forc'd to cry
“ out, O the Times! O the Manners! All things in
“ the Parts of *Europe* are deliver'd up to the power
“ of barbarous People. Cities are destroyed, Castles
“ demolished, Provinces depopulated, &c. and yet
“ the Bishops who ought to have lain prostrate on
“ the ground cover'd with Ashes and Weeping,
“ even they covet to themselves Names of Vanity,
“ and glory in new and prophane Titles. And yet
this Name of Vanity, this new and prophane Title

† *Exclamare compellor ac dicere, O tempora! O mores! Ecce eunſta in Europæ partibus barbarorum juri sunt tradita, destructa urbes; eversa Castra, depopulata Provincia, &c. Et tamen Sacerdotes, qui pavimento & cinere stentes jacere debuerunt, vanitatis sibi nomina expetunt, ac novis & profanis vocabulis gloriantur. Greg. lib. 4. Epist. 32.*

of Universal Bishop, was afterwards accepted by *Boniface III.* Bishop of *Rome*, when 'twas offer'd him by that bloody Mifcreant *Phocas* the Emperor; and the same Title hath been own'd by the succeeding Bishops of the Roman Church, and that as due to them by Divine Right. Indeed, it may be question'd whether *John* of *Constantinople*, by assuming the Title of *Oecumenical* Bishop, meant that he had an universal Jurisdiction over all other Bishops and Churches: But this is certain, that *Gregory* oppos'd the Title under this Notion; this appearing abundantly from his * Epistle to *John* the Patriarch; and 'tis as certain that under the same Notion the Bishops of *Rome* afterwards assum'd that Title, and do claim it to this Day. Nay, the *Universal Pastarship* and Jurisdiction of the Roman Bishop over all Bishops and Churches, is now no longer a meer Court-Opinion, maintain'd only by the Pope's Parasites and Flatterers, but is become a part of the Faith of the Church of *Rome*; it being one of the Articles of the *Trent Creed*, to which all Ecclesiasticks are sworn themselves, and which by the same Oath they are oblig'd to teach the Laity under their care and charge, as hereafter will appear. So that now there is no room for that Distinction, wherewith some have sooth'd and pleas'd themselves, between the Church and Court of *Rome*; for the Court is enter'd into the Church of *Rome*, or rather the Court and Church of *Rome* are all one.

Sect III. 2. The Church of *Rome* hath changed the *Primitive Canon* or *Rule* of Faith, by adding new Articles to it, as necessary to be believed in order to Salvation: Look to the Confession of Faith,

* Greg. lib. 4. Epist. 38.

according to the *Council of Trent*. It begins indeed with the Primitive Rule of Faith as explain'd by the Council of *Nice* and *Constantinople*; and happy had it been for the Church of Christ, if it had ended there. But there are added afterwards a many new Articles, and with reference to them as well as to the Articles of the old Creed, it concludes thus: † This “ true Catholick Faith, without which none can
 “ be saved, which I now willingly profess, and un-
 “ feignedly hold; the same I promise, vow, and
 “ swear, by the help of God, most constantly to
 “ keep and confess, entire and inviolate, even to
 “ my last Breath; and to endeavour moreover, to
 “ the utmost of my Power, that it may be kept,
 “ taught, and professed by all my Subjects, or by
 “ those that are any way under my Care. So. help
 “ me God, and these his holy Gospels.

Now if you examine those Articles that follow after the *Constantinopolitan* Creed, you will find they are not merely *explicatory* of any Article or Articles of the old Canon of Faith (such as that of the ὁμολογίᾳ in the *Nicene* Confession, which was virtually contain'd in the antient Canon, and by good consequence deducible from it, and was apparently also the sense of the Catholick Church before the *Nicene* Council) but they are plain *Additions* to the Rule of Faith. Now if these Articles were true, yet they ought not presently to be made a part of our

† Hanc veram Catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, quam in presenti sponte profiteor, & veraciter teneo, eandem integram & inviolatam, usque ad extremum vite spiritum, constantissime (Deo adjuvante) retinere & confiteri, atque à meis subditis, vel illis quorum cura ad me spectabit, teneri, doceri, & predicari, quantum in me erit, curaturum ego idem N. spondeo, voveo ac juro: Sic me Deus adjuvet, & hac sancta Dei Evangelia.

Creed;

Creed ; for every Truth is not fundamental, nor every Error damnable. We deny not, but that General or Provincial Councils may make Constitutions concerning extra-fundamental Verities, and oblige all such as are under their jurisdiction to receive them, at least passively, so as not openly and contumaciously to oppose them. But to make any of these a part of the Creed, and to oblige all Christians under pain of Damnation to receive and believe them, this is really to add to the Creed, and to change the antient *Canon* or *Rule of Faith*. But alas! these superadded Articles of the *Trent* Creed, are so far from being certain Truths, that they are most of them manifest Untruths, yea, gross and dangerous Errors. To make this appear, I shall not refuse the pains of examining some of the chief of them.

The first Article I shall take notice of is this ;
 “ † I profess, that in the Mass is offer'd to God a
 “ true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the
 “ Living and the Dead ; and that in the most holy
 “ Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, there is truly, and really,
 “ ally, and substantially the Body and Blood, together
 “ with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus
 “ Christ ; and that there is wrought a Conversion
 “ of the whole substance of the Bread into
 “ the Body, and of the whole substance of the
 “ Wine into the Blood, which Conversion the Catholic
 “ Church calls *Transubstantiation*. Where

† *Profiteor in missâ offerri Deo verum, proprium, & propitiatorium Sacrificium, pro vivis & defunctis, atque in sanctissimo Eucharistica Sacramento esse verè & realiter & substantialiter Corpus & Sanguinem, unâ cum animâ & Divinitatè Domini nostri Jesu Christi, fierique conversionem totius substantiæ Panis in Corpus & totius substantiæ vini in sanguinem, quam conversionem Catholica Ecclesia Transubstantiationem appellat.*

this Proposition [*That in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead,*] having that other of the *Substantial Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist* immediately annexed to it; the meaning of it must necessarily be this, That in the *Eucharist* the very Body and Blood of Christ are again offer'd up to God, as a propitiatory Sacrifice for the Sins of Men. Which is an impious Proposition derogatory to the one full Satisfaction of Christ made by his Death on the Cross, and contrary to express Scripture, *Heb. 7. and 27. and 9. and 12. 15, 26, 28. and 10. 12, 14.* It is true, the *Eucharist* is frequently call'd by the ancient Fathers *εὐχάριστος*, *Eucharia*, an Oblation, a Sacrifice. But it is to be remember'd, that they say also it is *δυσία λογικὴ καὶ ἀναιμὰ* *λογικὴ*, a reasonable Sacrifice, a Sacrifice without Blood: Which, how can it be said to be, if therein the very Blood of Christ were offer'd up to God?

They held the *Eucharist* to be a commemorative Sacrifice, and so do we. This is the constant Language of the antient Liturgies, † *We offer by way of commemoration*; according to our Saviour's Words when he ordain'd this holy Rite, * *Do this in commemoration of me.* In the *Eucharist* then, Christ is offer'd not *hypostatically* as the *Trent* Fathers have determin'd (for so he was but once offer'd) but *commemoratively* only: And this Commemoration is made to God the Father, and is not a bare remembering or putting our selves in mind of him. For

† *Μνησθῆναι προσέειπεν* *Commemorantes*, or *Commemorando offerimus.*

* *Τὸτο ποιεῖτε ἐκ τῆς ἐμῆς ἀνάμνησιν.* *Vid. Justin. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 296, 297.*

every

every Sacrifice is directed to God, and the Oblation therein made, whatsoever it be, hath him for its Object, and not Man. In the holy *Eucharist* therefore, we set before God the Bread and Wine, as *Figures or Images of the precious Blood of Christ shed for us, and of his precious Body* (they are the very words of the **Clementine Liturgy*) and plead to God the Merit of his Son's Sacrifice once offer'd on the Cross for us Sinners, and in this Sacrament represented, beseeching him for the sake thereof to bestow his heavenly Blessings on us.

To conclude this matter: The Ancients held the *Oblation* of the *Eucharist* to be answerable in some respects to the legal Sacrifices; that is, they believ'd that our Blessed Saviour ordain'd the Sacrament of the *Eucharist* as a Rite of Prayer and Praise to God, instead of the manifold and bloody Sacrifices of the Law. That the *legal Sacrifices* were Rites to invoke God by, is evident from many Texts of Scripture. See especially 1 *Sam.* 7. 9. and 13. 12. *Ezra* 6. 10. *Prov.* 15. 8. And that they were also Rites for praising and blessing God for his Mercies, appears from 2 *Chron.* 29. 27. Instead therefore of slaying of Beasts and burning of Incense, whereby they praised God, and call'd upon his Name under the Old Testament; the Fathers, I say, believed our Saviour appointed this Sacrament of Bread and Wine, as a Rite whereby to give Thanks and make supplication to his Father in his Name. This you may see fully clear'd and prov'd by the learned Mr. *Mede*, in his Treatise intituled, *The Christian Sacrifice*. The *Eucharistical* Sacrifice thus explain'd, is indeed λογική θυσία, a *reasonable Sacrifice*, widely

* Τὸ τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸ λαμβάνοντες ὑμεῖς καὶ τὸ τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ ἀντίστοιχου. *Constitut. Apost.* l. 7. c. 26.

different from that monstrous Sacrifice of the Mass, taught in the Church of *Rome*.

The other Branch of the Article is concerning *Transubstantiation*, wherein the Ecclesiastick professeth upon his solemn Oath his Belief, that in the the Eucharist *there is made a Conversion of the whole Substance of the Bread into the Body, and of the whole Substance of the Wine into the Blood of Christ*. A Proposition that bids defiance to all the Reason and Sense of Mankind. Nor. (God be praised) hath it any ground or foundation in divine Revelation: Nay, the Text of Scripture on which the Church of *Rome* builds this Article, duly consider'd, utterly subverts and overthrows it: She grounds it upon the words of the Institution of the holy Sacrament by our Saviour, the same Night wherein he was betrayed; when he took Bread, and brake it, and gave it to his Disciples, saying, *This is my Body*, τὸ δίδω-
μεν, saith St. *Luke*, τὸ κλάωμεν saith St. *Paul*, *which is given and broken for you*. After the same manner he took the Cup, and gave Thanks, and gave it to them saying, *Drink ye all of this, for this is my Blood of the New Testament*, ἐκχυσόμεν, *which is shed for many for the Remission of Sins*. Now whatsoever our Saviour said, was undoubtedly true: But these words must necessarily be understood in a figurative Sense; and then, what becomes of the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*? The meaning of our Saviour is plainly this: What I now do, is a representation of my Death and Passion near approaching; and what I now do, do ye hereafter do this in remembrance of me; let this be a standing perpetual Ordinance in my Church to the end of the World; let my Death be thus annunciated and shewn forth till I come to Judgment. See *I Cor. II. 26*.

As little Foundation hath this Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* in the ancient Church, as appears sufficiently

ficiently from what hath been already said concerning the Notion then universally received of the *Eucharistical* Sacrifice. It was then believ'd to be an *ἀνάμνησις*, or Commemoration, by the Symbols of Bread and Wine, of the Body and Blood of Christ, once offer'd up to God on the Cross for our Redemption; it could not therefore be then thought an offering up again to God of the very Body and Blood of Christ, substantially present under the Appearance of Bread and Wine; for these two Notions are inconsistent and cannot stand together. The ancient Doctors, yea, and the Liturgies of the Church affirm the Eucharist to be *incrumentum Sacrificium*, a sacrifice without Blood; which it cannot be said to be, if the very Blood of Christ were therein present and offer'd up to God. In the *Clementine* Liturgy the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist are said to be *Antitypa*, correspondent Types, Figures, and Images of the precious Body and Blood of Christ. And divers others of the Fathers speak in the same plain Language. *Vid. Greg. Naz. Apol. Orat. 1. Tom. 1. Cyril. Hierosol. 5. Cat. Myst. Ambros. de Sacrament. lib. 4. cap. 4.*

We are not ignorant, that the ancient Fathers generally teach, that the Bread and Wine in the *Eucharist*, by or upon the Consecration of them, do become, and are made the *Body and Blood of Christ*. But we know also, that tho' they do not all explain themselves in the same way, yet they do all declare their Sense to be very dissonant from the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. Some of the most ancient Doctors of the Church, as *Justin Martyr* and *Irenaeus*, seem to have had this Notion, that by or upon the sacerdotal Benediction, the Spirit of Christ or a divine Virtue from Christ descends upon the Elements, and accompanies them to all worthy Communicants, and that therefore they are said to be, and are the

the Body and Blood of Christ; the same Divinity, which is hypostatically united to the Body of Christ in Heaven, being virtually united to the Elements of Bread and Wine on Earth. Which also seems to be the meaning of all the antient Liturgies, in which it is pray'd *that God would send down his Spirit upon the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist.* And this doubtless is the meaning of *Origen* in his eighth Book against *Celsus*, p. 399. Where speaking of the holy Eucharist he says, that therein † [“ We “ eat Bread by prayer (*i. e.* by the prayer of Consecration for the descent of the divine Spirit upon it) “ made a certain holy Body, which also sanctifies those, who with a sound or sincere purpose “ of Heart use it.”] But that neither *Justin Martyr* nor *Irenæus*, nor *Origen* ever dream'd of the Transubstantiation of the Elements is most evident. For *Justin Martyr* and *Irenæus* do both of them plainly affirm, that by eating and drinking the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, *our Bodies are nourish'd*, and that the *Bread and Wine are digested and turn'd into the Substance of our Bodies*; which to affirm of the glorified Body of Christ, were impious and blasphemous, and to affirm the same of the mere Accidents of the Bread and Wine, would be very absurd and ridiculous. And *Origen* expressly saith “ That “ what we eat in the Eucharist is Bread, but Bread “ sanctify'd and made holy by Prayer, and which by “ the divine Virtue that accompanies it, sanctifieth all “ those who worthily receive it. He that would see more of this notion of the ancient Fathers, and particularly those places of *Justin Martyr* and *Ire-*

† Ἄφες ἐν τῷ μυστήριον τοῦ σώματος γινώσκουσιν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ ἀγνοοῦντες τὸ μυστήριον οὐκ ὀφείλουσι αὐτὰς χρῆσθαι.

new fully clear'd and vindicated, from the forced and absurd glosses of the *Romanists*, may consult my learned Friend Mr. *Grabe*, in his notes upon *Justin Martyr's* first Apology of his own Edition, p. 128, 129. but especially in his large and elaborate Annotation upon *Irenaeus*, lib. 4. cap. 34.

I shall dismiss this Article with this one only observation, that after the prodigious Doctrine of Transubstantiation was confirm'd by the first *Lateran* Council, there were many in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, who could not digest it, did not in truth believe it, and wish'd from their Hearts that their Church had never defined it. For this we have the ample Testimonies of very eminent Writers of that Church. " The conversion of the Bread and
 " Wine into Christ's Body and Blood, saith *Cajetan*,
par. 3. qu. 75. Article 1. all of us do teach in words but
 " indeed many deny it, thinking nothing less. These
 " are diversely divided one from another. For some
 " by the Conversion that is in the Sacrament, un-
 " derstand nothing but identity of place, that is,
 " that the Bread is therefore said to be made the Bo-
 " dy of Christ, because where the Bread is, the Bo-
 " dy of Christ becomes present also. Others un-
 " derstand by the word *conversion* nothing else but
 " the order of Succession, that is, that the Body
 " succeedeth and is under the veils of accidents,
 " under which the Bread, which they suppose to
 " be annihilated, was before. *Occam Centilogii con-*
clus. cap. 19. saith, " There are three Opinions about
 " Transubstantiation, of which the first supposeth a
 " a conversion of the sacramental Elements, the
 " second the Annihilation, the third affirmeth the
 " Bread to be in such manner transubstantiated into
 " the Body of Christ, that it is no way chang'd in sub-
 " stance, or substantially converted into Christ's Body,
 " or

" or doth cease to be, but only that the Body of Christ
 " in every part of it becomes present in every part
 " of the Bread. *Waldensis*, *Tom. 2. de Sacram. Eu-*
charistie, cap. 19. reports out of *Christopolitanus*
Zacharias his Book entituled *Quatuor unum*, " That
 " there were some, perhaps many, but hardly to be
 " discern'd and noted, who thought still as *Beren-*
garus did. The same *Waldensis*, in the same
 Book, cap. 64. saith, " That some supposed the
 " conversion that is in the Sacrament, to be, in that
 " the Bread and Wine are assumed into the unity of
 " Christ's Person; some thought it to be by way of
 " impanation, and some by way of figurative and
 " tropical appellation. The first and second of these
 " Opinions, found the better Entertainments in some
 " Mens minds, because they grant the essential pre-
 " sence of Christ's Body, and yet deny not the pre-
 " sence of the Bread still remaining, to sustain the
 " appearing accidents. These Opinions he reports
 " to have been very acceptable to many, not with-
 " out sighs wishing the Church had decreed that
 " Men should follow one of them.

It cannot be doubted, but that there are at this
 day many in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*,
 who are in the same perplexity about this Article
 of Transubstantiation, and have the same wishes,
 that their Church had never made it an Article of
 their Faith; for the absurdities of Transubstan-
 tiation and the reason of Mankind are still the same.
 Now what a lamentable condition are they in, who
 are forced to profess (yea and all Ecclesiasticks now
 by the *Trent* Confession in the most solemn manner to
 swear) that they believe what they cannot for their
 Hearts believe; whose Consciences, between the
 determinations of their Church, and the dictates of
 their own reason, yea and sense too, are continually
 ground,

ground, as between two Millstones! I have been long upon this Article; but shall be more brief on the next.

The next Article is this: " I † confess also, that " under one kind only whole and entire Christ, and " the whole Sacrament is received. Now this Article of the *sufficiency of the Sacrament of the Eucharist taken only in one kind*, as it refers to, and is design'd to justify the practice of the *Roman Church*, in the constant and publick administration of the Sacrament to all the Laity only in one kind, *viz.* the Bread, denying them the Cup; is manifestly against our Saviour's first Institution of the Sacrament, against Apostolical Practice, and the Usage of the Universal Church of Christ for a thousand Years, as is confessed by divers learned Men of the *Roman Communion*. And yet according to the *Trent Creed* all Men all are damn'd, that do not assent to the insolent (and as I may justly term it) *Anti-christian Decree* of the *Roman Church* in this point. And who can without astonishment reflect on the stiffness, and obstinacy, and uncharitableness of the *Trent Fathers* in this matter! Before they met, when it was noised that a Council should be called to redress the manifold Abuses and Corruptions that were in the Church, it was the longing Expectation and earnest desire of many good Men, that amongst other things the Communion in both kinds might be restored to the Laity. There were a multitude of pious Souls, as it were upon their Knees before them, thirsting after the Cup of Blessing, and earnestly begging for an entire Sacrament. But those *Duri Patres*, those hard-hearted Fathers had no compas-

† *Fateor etiam sub alterâ tantùm specie, totum atque integrum Christum verumque Sacramentum sumi.*

sion on them, turn'd a deaf ear to their loud crys and supplications, only bidding them believe for the future (what they could not believe) that half the Sacrament was every whit as good as the whole.

Immediately follows this Article: " I * firmly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the Souls detained there are relieved by the Prayers of the Faithful. Now this Article of a *Purgatory after this Life*, as it is understood and taught by the *Roman Church* (that is, to be a place and state of misery and torment, whereinto many faithful Souls go presently after death, and there remain till they are thoroughly purged from their dross, or deliver'd thence by Masses, Indulgences, &c.) is contrary to Scripture, and the sense of the *Catholick Church* for at least the first *four Centuries*, as I have at large proved in a Discourse concerning the *State of the Souls of Men in the interval between Death and the Resurrection*: Which I am ready to communicate to *Monsieur de Meaux* if he shall desire it. Indeed the Doctrine of *Purgatory* is not only an Error, but a dangerous one too, which (I am verily persuaded-) hath betray'd a multitude of Souls into eternal perdition, who might have escaped Hell, if they had not depended upon an after-game in Purgatory. But this Article being very gainful to the *Roman Clergy*, must above others be held fast, and constantly maintain'd and defended. " I † firmly hold it.

Prayers for the dead, as founded on the Hypothesis of Purgatory (and we no otherwise reject them) fall together with it. The Prayers for the

* *Constanter teneo, Purgatorium esse, animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis juvari.*

† *Constanter teneo.*

dead used in the ancient Church (those I mean that were more properly Prayers, *i.e.* either deprecations, or petitions) were of two sorts, either the common and general commemoration of all the faithful at the oblation of the holy Eucharist, or the particular Prayers used at the Funerals of any of the faithful lately deceased. The former respected their final absolution, and the Consummation of their Bliss at the Resurrection; like as that our Church useth both in the Office for the Communion, and in that for the Burial of the Dead: Which indeed seems to be no more than what we daily pray for in that petition of the Lord's Prayer (if we rightly understand it) *Thy Kingdom come.* The latter were also charitable omens and good wishes of the Faithful living, as it were accompanying the Soul of the deceased to the joys of Paradise, of which they believed it already possessed, as the ancient Author of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* in his last Chapter of that Book plainly informs us. In a word, let any understanding and unprejudiced Person attentively observe the Prayers for the dead in the most undoubtedly ancient Liturgies, especially those in the *Clementine Liturgy*, and those mentioned in the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*; and he will be so far from believing the *Roman Purgatory* upon the account of those Prayers, that he must needs see they make directly against it. For they all run (as even that Prayer for the dead, which is unadvisedly left by the Romanists in their own *Canon of the Mass*, as a Testimony against themselves) in this form: *For all that are in peace or at rest in the Lord.* Now how can they be said to be in peace, or at rest in the Lord, who are supposed to be in a state of Misery and Torment?

The

The next Article is this: " As † also that the
 " Saints reigning together with Christ are to be ve-
 " nerated and invoked, and that they offer up
 " Prayers to God for us; and that their Relicks
 " are to be venerated. Now for the *Worship* and
Invocation of Saints deceased there is no ground or
 foundation in the Holy Scriptures, no Precept, no
 Example. Nay it is by evident consequence forbid-
 den in the prohibition of the *Worship* and *Invocati-*
on of Angels, Col. 2. v. 18. with which Text
 compare the 35 Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*,
 and the judgment of the learned Father *Theodoret*
 concerning it, who flourished shortly after that
 Council. He in his Notes upon that Text of
 St. Paul, hath these express words, *The * Synod met*
at Laodicea in Phrygia made a Law forbidding Men
to pray even to the Angels. See also *Zonaras* upon
 the same Canon. He, as well as *Theodoret* long
 before him, rightly judged, that both in the Text of
 St. Paul and in the *Laodicean* Canon, all Prayers o
 Angels are forbidden. Now if we must not pray to
 Angels, then much less may we pray to Saints.
 The Angels are ministring Spirits, sent forth to mi-
 nister to them who shall be Heirs of Salvation: They
 watch over us, and are frequently present with us,
 nay they are *internuncii*, Messengers between God
 and us, conveying God's Blessings to us and our
 Prayers to God, *Act.* 10, & 4. *Apoc.* 8, & 3. none
 of which things are any where affirm'd of the de-
 ceased Saints: And yet we must not pray even to
 the Angels.

† *Similiter & sanctos unâ cum Christo regnantes venerandos &
 invocandos esse, eoque orationes Deo pro nobis offerre, eorumque
 reliquias esse venerandas.*

* Ἡ Σύνοδος ὁμοῦς ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ τῇ Φρυγίας νόμον
 ἐκάλυψε καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις προσεύχεσθαι.

Hear

Hear also *Origen* who lived long before the *Ladicean* Council, delivering the sense of the Church of his time in this matter, *lib. 5. contra Cels. p. 233. Edit. Cantab.* where he excellently discourseth against the religious Worship and Invocation of Angels, in opposition to which he first lays down this as a received Doctrine among all Catholic Christians, " That † all Prayers, all Supplications, Deprecations, and Thanksgivings are to be offered to God the Lord of all, by the Chief High Priest, who is above all Angels, the living Word, and God. And presently after he shews the folly and unreasonableness of praying to Angels upon several accounts. As first, because the particular knowledge of Angels, and what offices they severally perform is a secret which we cannot reach to ; which is the very Reason which *St. Paul* suggests in the Text before-mentioned, that whosoever worships and invokes the Angels, doth * *intrude into those things which he hath not seen.* From whence we may easily gather, that *Origen* in this discourse of his had an eye to that Text of *St. Paul*, and understood it as we do, to be a prohibition of all Prayer to Angels. 2. He argues that if we should suppose, that we could attain such particular knowledge of the Angels, yet it would not be lawful for us to pray to them or any other, save to God the Lord of all, who alone is all sufficient, abundantly able to supply all our wants and necessities, through our Saviour Jesus Christ, the Son of God, his Word, Wisdom, and Truth. Lastly, He reasons to this effect, that the best way to gain the

† *Omnia vota, omnes interpellationes deprecationes & gratiarum actiones offerendas esse Deo rerum omnium Domino, per majorem omnibus Angelis summum Pontificem, vivum Verbum & Deum.*

* *Ἄ μὴ ἐνέγαντες ἐν ἑαυτοῖς.*

good will of those blessed Spirits is not to pray to them, but to imitate them by paying our Devotions to God alone, as they do. Hear the same *Origen*, *lib. 8. p. 402.* where to *Celsus* talking of those Spirits that preside over the affairs of Men here below, who were thought to be appeased only by Prayers to them in a barbarous Language, he answers with derision and tells him, he forgot with whom he had to do, and that he was speaking to Christians, who † pray to God alone thro' Jesus. And then he adds, that the genuine Christians in their prayers to God, used no barbarous words, but prayed to him in the language of their respective Countries, the *Greek* Christians in the *Greek* Tongue, the *Romans* in the *Roman* Language; as knowing that the God to whom they prayed understood all Tongues and Languages, and heard and accepted their Prayers in their severall Languages, as well as if they had address'd themselves to him in one and the same Language. Again in the same Book. *p. 420.* to *Celsus* discoursing much after the same rate, he gives this excellent answer: " The * one
 " God, the Lord of all, is to be aton'd by us, and
 " must be entreated to be propitious to us, Piety
 " and Prayers being the best means of appeasing
 " him. And if *Celsus* would have others applied
 " to after him, let him assure himself, that as the
 " Body's Motion unavoidably moves its Shadow, so
 " likewise when God is once become propitious to
 " any, all his Angels, Souls, and Spirits will be-

† Τοῖς μόνοι τοῖς θεῶν δια τῆ Ἰησοῦ εὐχαριστοῖς.

* Ἐνα μόνον ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐμῇ πίστει Θεός, &c. Unus est nobis placandus Deus universorum Dominus, atque ut propitius sit exorandus, qui utique pietate & precibus placatur. Si vult post hunc placari etiam alios; cogitet quod sicut moto corpore, umbra quoque ipsius movetur, ita, cum aliquis Deum habet propitium, sequitur ut amicos habeat omnes ejus Angelos, Animas & Spiritus.

come

“ come Friends to such an one. From these Testimonies of *Origen*, to which more might be added, it is very evident that the Catholick Christians of his time made no Prayers either to Angels or Saints, but directed all their Prayers to God through the alone mediation of Jesus Christ our Saviour. Indeed, against the Invocations of Angels and Saints, we have the concurrent Testimonies of all the Catholick Fathers of the first three Centuries at least. For as to that Testimony of *Justin Martyr* in his second (or rather first) Apology for the Christians, *p.* 56. alledged by *Bellarmin* and others of his Party, for the worshipping of Angels as practised in the Primitive Times of the Church, I have given a clear account of it *Def. Fid. Nic.* §. 2. c. 4. §. 8. where I have evidently proved that place of *Justin* to be so far from giving any countenance to the Religious Worship of Angels, that it makes directly against it. And the like may be easily shewn of the other Allegations of *Bellarmin* out of the Primitive Fathers.

To conclude ; Look into the most antient Liturgies, as particularly that described in the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, and the *Clementine Liturgy*, contain'd in the Book, entituled, the *Apostolical Constitutions* ; and you will not find in them one Prayer of any sort to Angels or Saints, no, not so much as an oblique Prayer (as they term it) *i. e.* a Prayer directed to God, that he would hear the intercession of Angels and Saints for us. And yet after all this, they are for ever damn'd by the *Trent Creed*, who do not hold and practice the Invocation of the Saints deceased. For this is one of the Articles of that Creed, without the belief whereof, they tell us, * *none can be saved* : That is all are damned

* *Nemo saluus esse potest.*

who pray unto God alone through Christ the Mediator, as the Scripture directs, and the Catholick Church of the first and best Ages hath practised.

As to what follows, *that the Saints departed do offer up their Prayers to God for us*; if it be understood of the intercession of the Saints in general, we deny it not. But this is no reason why we should pray to them to pray for us. Nay, on the contrary, if the deceased Saints do of their own accord, and out of their perfect Charity pray for us, what need we be so solicitous to call upon them for their Prayers, especially, when our Reason and Scripture also tell us, that we are out of their hearing, and that they do not, cannot know our particular Wants and Necessities? For, as to what the Romanists tell us of the *Glass of the Trinity* and extraordinary Revelations; they are bold presumptuous Conjectures, destitute of any ground or colour from Reason or Scripture, and indeed are inconsistent with one another. To be sure, that conceit of the *Glass of the Trinity* would never have passed with the Fathers of the first Ages: For they generally held, *That the Souls of the Righteous* (some indeed excepted of the Souls of the Martyrs) *do not presently after Death ascend to the third Heaven, but go to a place and state of inferior Bliss and Happiness* (which they commonly call by the Name of *Paradise*, tho' where it is situated they do not all agree) *and there remain till the Resurrection of their Bodies; after which, they shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, and there for ever enjoy that consummate Bliss and Happiness which consists in that clear Vision of God, which the holy Scripture calls seeing him Face to Face.* And indeed, their distinction of *Paradise* (the receptacle of holy Souls presently after Death) from the third Heaven, seems to have
firm

firm ground in the New Testament. *Vide Luke 23, 43. 2 Cor. 12. and 2, 3, 4. and Grot. in Loca;* and was undoubtedly received in the Church of God before the coming of the Lord in the Flesh. However, this was a current Doctrine in the Christian Church for many Ages; till at length the *Popish Council of Florence* boldly determin'd the contrary, defining, *† That those Souls, which having contracted the blemish of Sin, being either in their Bodies or out of them purged from it, are presently received into Heaven, and there clearly behold God himself, one God in three Persons, as he is.* This Decree they craftily made, partly to establish the Superstition of praying to Saints deceased, whom they would make us to believe to see and know all our Necessities and Concerns in *speculo Trinitatis*, as was said before, and so to be fit Objects of our religious Invocation; partly and chiefly to confirm the Doctrine of Purgatory, and that the Prayers of the ancient Church for the Dead, might be thought to be founded upon a supposition that the Souls of some, nay, most faithful Persons after Death go into a place of grievous Torment, out of which they may be deliver'd by the Prayers, Masses, and Alms of the Living. But this by the way.

It is added in the Creed, *That not only the Saints themselves, but also their Reliques are to be worshipp'd.* A strange definition of the *Trent* Fathers, especially if we consider the time when it was made; a time when the best and wisest Men in the Roman Communion sadly complain'd of the vile Cheat put upon the poor ignorant People, by shewing them I know not what Reliques of Saints, and drawing them to the Worship of them, only for

† *Eas animas que post contractam peccati maculam, &c.*

Gain's sake, and to pick their Pockets. Hear the Judgment of the learned and pious *Cassander*, as to this Article: * " Seeing there are a small number
 " of true and approved Reliques, especially in these
 " Provinces, and many of those which are made
 " shew of, are too apparently liable to a Suspicion,
 " and the frequenting and veneration of them is
 " of little service to true Piety and Devotion,
 " though of very much to Superstition or Gain; it
 " seems to me much more proper, that all such
 " Ostentation of Miracles were forborn, and the
 " People were invited to worship the true Reliques
 " of Saints; that is, the Examples of Piety and
 " Virtue they have left behind them for our imita-
 " tion, as is recorded in what has been written ei-
 " ther by them, or of them.

The next Article of the *Trent* Creed is this:
 " † I most firmly assert, that the Images of Christ,
 " and the ever Virgin Mother of God, and other
 " Saints, are to be had and retain'd, and that due
 " Honour and Veneration are to be given them. A
 doughty Article indeed, worthy to be usher'd in
 with a *Firmissime assero*! But is this really an Ar-
 ticle of the Catholick Christian Faith, without the
 belief whereof there is no Salvation? What then is

* *Cum vera & comperta reliquia, præsertim in his Provinciis perpaucæ sint, & multa ex iis quæ ostentantur non temerè suspectæ haberi possint, atque illorum frequentatio & veneratio non multum pietati, plurimum verò superstitioni vel questui serviant; multò consultius videtur, ut ab omni reliquiarum ostentatione abstineatur, & populus ad veras Sanctorum reliquias colendas, id est, exempla Pietatis & virtutum quæ in Scriptis, vel ab ipsis, vel de ipsis extant imitanda provocetur.*

† *Firmissime assero imagines Christi ac Deiparæ semper Virginis, nec non aliorum Sanctorum habendas & retinendas esse, atque eis debitum honorem & venerationem impertiendam.*

become

become again of the Catholick Church of the first three Centuries and downwards? For it is certain, that the Church of those Days never allowed the use of Images in her Oratories or Conventicles, much less the Adoration and Worship of them. This appears from what we read of *Adrian* the Roman Emperor, related by *Ælius Lampridius* in the Life of *Alexander Severus*; that he favouring the Christians, and willing to gratify them in their way of Worship, commanded that they should have Temples built for them without any Images in them, as well knowing their utter aversion to the setting up of Images in the places of their religious Worship. This also more plainly appears from the Writings of the Christian Apologists of those Times against the Heathens objecting to them, that they had no Images that they worship'd, and consequently, that they were Atheists, and worship'd no God at all; for they thought there could be no religious Worship of any thing without some visible Image of the Object to be worship'd, and finding no Image at all of any sort in the Oratories of the Christians, they concluded that the Christians worship'd no Deity. Now our Apologists are so far from pleading to this Objection, that the Christians had Images in their places of Worship, that they answer without any distinction by way of concession, and that not only granting that they had no Images, but affirming they ought not to have them, and condemn'd the Gentiles which had. See *Minutius Felix*, *Arnobius*, and *Lactantius*.

In the fourth Century indeed there were some attempts to bring in Pictures into the Christian Oratories, but they were presently check'd and repress'd by the Governours of the Church, as appears from the 36th Canon of the Council of *Elberis* in Spain, and from the Relation which *Epi-*

phanus gives us (who flourish'd towards the end of the fourth Century) in his Epistle to *John* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, translated by St. *Ferom* out of Greek into Latin. Tom. 2. Oper. *Hieronymi*; where he tells *John* of *Jerusalem*, that going into a Church in the Village of *Anablatha* to pray, he found there a Picture hanging up, which (though it were out of his own Diocese) he cut in pieces, as being scandalous and contrary to the holy Scriptures; and desires *John* to take care for the future, that no such Pictures be hung up in any Church under his Jurisdiction. The words of *Epiphanius* are these: † “ At my entrance into the Church to pray, I saw
 “ there a Veil hanging within the Doors of the
 “ same Church, died and painted, and having the
 “ Image as it were of Christ or some Saint, for
 “ I do not, well remember whose it was. When
 “ therefore I had seen this Image of a Man hang-
 “ ing in the Church of Christ, against the Au-

† Cum intrâssem in Ecclesiam ut orarem, inveni ibi velum pendens in foribus ejusdem Ecclesie tinctum atque depictum, & habens imaginem quasi Christi, vel Sancti cujusdam, non enim satis memini cujus Imago fuerit; cum ergo hoc vidissem, in Ecclesia Christi contra auctoritatem Scripturarum hominis pendere imaginem, scidi illud, & magis dedi consilium custodibus ejusdem loci, ut pauperem mortuum eo obvolverent & efferrent. Illique contra murmurantes dixerunt, si scindere voluerat, justum erat ut aliud daret velum atque mutaret. Quod cum audissem, me datum esse pollicitus sum, & illico esse missurum. Paululum autem morarum fuit in medio, dum quero optimum velum pro eo mittere, arbitrabar enim de Cypro mihi esse mittendum. Nunc autem misi, quod potui reperire, & precor ut jubeas Presbyteros ejusdem loci suscipere velum à latore, quod à nobis missum est: & deinceps precipere, ut in Ecclesia Christi istiusmodi vela, qua contra religionem nostram veniunt, non appendi. Decet enim bonestatem tuam hanc magis habere sollicitudinem, ut scrupulositatem tollat, que indigna est Ecclesia Christi, & populis qui tibi crediti sunt.

“ *thorities*

"thority of the Scriptures, I tore it in pieces, and
 "advised the Keepers of the place to wrap there-
 "with a poor dead Man, and carry him to burial
 "in it. And whereas they on the other hand mur-
 "mured, saying, that if he would tear the Veil,
 "he ought in Justice to change it, and give them
 "another for it ; I no sooner heard this, but I pro-
 "mised to give them one, and that I would send it
 "presently. However, some little time past, whilst
 "I was seeking after the best Veil, to send them it ;
 "for I thought I must send one from *Cyprus*. But
 "now I have sent such as I could meet with ; and
 "I beseech thee, command the Presbyters of that
 "place to receive the Veil from the Bearer which
 "we have sent, and to command for the future,
 "that no such Veils as are contrary to our Religion
 "be hung up in the Church of Christ. For it be-
 "comes thy Worth to have the greater care in this
 "respect, that thou mayest take away all such
 "scrupulosity, as is unworthy of the Christian
 "Church and the People committed to thy charge.
 The Authority of this Epistle is vindicated from
 the Cavils of *Bellarmin*, by the learned *Andrew*
Rivet, in his *Critice Sacr. Spec. lib. cap. 29*. How
 would the Zeal of this great and good Bishop
 have been inflam'd, if he had seen what we now
 a-days see, not only Pictures but massy Images in
 Churches, and People praying, kneeling, and burn-
 ing Incense before them.

By what means image-Worship in After-Ages en-
 ter'd into the Church, is not so easy to tell ; nor is
 it very necessary. But this is certain, that about the
 beginning of the eighth Century it had gotten great
 ground. For in the Year of our Lord 754, in the
 Reign of *Constantine*, nick-nam'd *Copronymus*, a Ge-
 neral Council was convened at *Constantinople*, con-
 sisting of 338 Bishops, declaring it self the seventh
 General

General Council. *Vide Syn. CP. in Aët. Syn. Nic. 2. p. 621. Edit. Col. An. 1618.* This Synod expressly condemn'd all Worship of Images, *decreeing it to be abominable; and that all Images of whatsoever Matter or Colour they were made, should be cast out of all Christian Churches.* Ibid. p. 965. And presently after they decree severe Punishments to any Man *that should dare from thence forward, to make, worship, or set up in the Church, or in his own House, any such Image, as being a transgressor of the Commandment of God, and an Enemy to the Doctrine of the Fathers.* Where observe, that the Bishops of this Council condemn all Image-Worship, as contrary both to Scripture, and also *to the Doctrine of the Fathers of the Church that were before them,* as indeed we have already shewn it to be. In this Council, *Germanus*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, *Georgius Cyprius*, and *Damascene* a Monk, who were the chief sticklers for Image-Worship, were excommunicated.

About 30 Years after, *viz. Ann. 787*, another Council met at *Constantinople* first, and was afterwards translated to *Nice*, in which the Decree of the former Synod was exploded, and Image-Worship first established in the Church. This Council was call'd by the Empress *Irene* a bigotted Image-Worshipper: She had so great an Influence upon this Synod, that partly by her Persuasions, partly by her Threatnings, several Bishops wh in the former Synod had condemn'd Image-Worship, were now for it. Among these, *Basilus*, Bishop of *Ancyra*, *Theodorus*, Bishop of *Myra*, and *Theodosius* Bishop of *Amorium*, were brought in as *Pompæ Circenses*, and offer'd to this Council their Letters supplicant, confessing that they had sinn'd in condemning the Worship of Images in the Synod convened by

by *Constantinus Copronymus: Dux femina facti*. It was a Woman that first brought this childish Worship (the great *Hincmar* of *Rhemes* calls it *Puparum cultum*, *Baby-Worship*) into the Church of Christ. The Bishops in this Synod, being destitute of Scripture Proof and Authentick Tradition for their Image-Worship, betook themselves † to certain *Apocryphal and ridiculous Stories*, as *Charles the Great* observ'd. For in this Synod, a Letter from *Adrian* Bishop of *Rome* to *Constantine* and *Irene* was produced, and openly read, full of the most ridiculous Fables, as particularly concerning the Leprosy of *Constantine the Great* before his Conversion; the barbarous Remedy that he sought after by the Blood of innocent Babes, the appearing of *St. Peter* and *St. Paul* to him in a Dream, advising him to send for Pope *Sylvester*, who, upon we know not what Persecution raised by *Constantine* against the *Christians*, was fled with his Clergy to the Mountain *Soracte*, and there hid themselves in the Caves thereof; that when *Sylvester* came to him, he commanded his Deacons to produce the Images of *St. Peter* and *Paul*, which as soon as the Emperor saw, he cryed out aloud, *These are the very Images that I saw in my Dream; I am convinced, I believe, and desire the Laver of Baptism*; which, when he had received, he was immediately cured of his Leprosy: That thereupon, in gratitude for the Benefit he had receiv'd, he order'd Churches to be built for the *Christians*, whose Walls and Pillars should be adorn'd with the holy Images of Christ and the Saints. Was there ever such a Legend offer'd to a Synod of Bishops? And yet this Letter of *Adrian*

† *Ad Apocryphas quasdam & risu dignas nanias.* Car. M. l. 3. c. 3.

was accepted, and approv'd of by the whole Council. Had none of them read the Life of *Constantine* written by *Eusebius*?

Wherefore about seven Years after, viz. An. 794, this *Nicene Synod* was condemn'd, and abdicated by a Council of about 300 Bishops convened at *Frankfort* by *Charles the Great*, King of *France*. In this Synod were present not only the Bishops of *France*, but also of *Germany* and *Lombardy*, as Provinces subdued to the King of *France*. Pope *Adrian* also sent his Legates thither, and the Great *Charles* himself honoured this Council with his Presence.

The *Romanists* are hard put to it to ward the stroke of this Council against the Worshippers of Images. They have several evasions. † *Genebrard* and * *Bellarmin* tell us that the Fathers at *Frankfort* mistook the meaning of the 2d *Nicene Council*, as thinking they had decreed “ || The Worship “ due to God alone to be given to the Images of the Saints, which they were very far from doing. But it is far more probable that *Genebrard* and *Bellarmin* were both grossly mistaken. There were assembled in this Council almost all the learned Bishops of the West; they had the Acts of the 2d *Nicene Synod* before them, and diligently perused them, and upon examination condemn'd them as to the point of Image-Worship. Besides, our *Alcuinus*, the Emperor's Tutor, the most learned Man of that Age, had before so fully examined the *Nicene Acts* that he wrote a learned Discourse against them, and notably refuted them, as we shall hear by and by.

† *Geneb. lib. 3. Chron. An. 794.*

* *Bellarmin. lib. 2. de Imag. cap. 14.*

|| *Cultumlatia.*

Lastly,

Lastly, it is certain that the Fathers of the Council of *Frankford* did not condemn only *Cultum latriæ* given to Images, but all manner of religious Worship.

* Others therefore tell us that they who urge the Testimony of the *Frankford* Synod against Image Worship are utterly mistaken; that the Synod which the Fathers at *Frankford* condemn'd was not the Council of *Nice*, but that of *Constantinople* under *Constantinus Copronymus*; that the *Frankford* Synod perfectly agreed with the Fathers of the *Nicene* Council, and confirm'd the worship of Images. This is strange News indeed, but it is far from being true. The mistake of those Writers who tell us this (if it were a mistake in them, and not a wilful prevarication) arose from hence, that the Synod which established Image Worship met first (as I noted before) at *Constantinople*, tho' it was afterwards translated to *Nice*; and so might be truly said to be a Council convened at *Constantinople*, and thereupon be mistaken for that Council of *Constantinople* which was convened by *Constantinus Copronymus*, which was indeed confirm'd by the *Frankford* Fathers. But that it was the Council of *Nice*, that was condemn'd by the Synod at *Frankford*, and that upon this very account that it had introduced Image Worship into the Church, we have abundant evidence.

For this is testified not only by *Walsfridus Strabo*, but also by *Ado Viennensis* and *Regino Præmensis* in their Histories; with whom *Abbas Uspergensis* agrees in his Chronicle, where he thus writes: " In
" † the Year 793, whilst *Charles* was celebrating the
" Feast

* *Sirius in admon. ad Lectorem pro Syn. Frank. Coriolanus in Concilio Frank. ad An. 794.*

† *Anno Dom. DCCXCIII. Carolo in Franc: Paschâ celebrante, Synodus Episcoporum magna collecta est, ex omnibus regni provincijs:*

“ Feast of *Easter* in *France*, a numerous Synod of
 “ Bishops was gathered together out of all the Pro-
 “ vinces of the Realm; the Legates of Pope *Adrian* were there also in his stead. In this Synod
 “ the Heresy of a certain Bishop named *Felix* was
 “ condemned. ——— The Synod likewise which
 “ a few Years before met at *Constantinople* under *I-*
 “ *rene* and *Constantine* her Son, and was called the
 “ seventh General Council, was universally renoun-
 “ ced as useless, that so it might neither be stiled the
 “ 7th, nor by any other name. That the Council
 here said to be condemned by the *Frankford* Synod,
 was the second Council of *Nice* is evident, for it is
 expressly said to be the Council conven’d under the
 Empress *Irene* and *Constantine* her Son, and that
 but a few Years before. But it is said to be conven’d
 at *Constantinople* because there indeed it first met,
 as was noted before.

Add to this the Testimony of *Hincmar* of *Rhemes*,
 an Author in all respects most worthy of credit in
 this matter: “ In * the time of the Emperor *Char-*
 “ *lemaign*, a General Synod was held in *France* by
 “ order of the Apostolick See, the said Emperor
 “ convening it. And according to the direction of
 “ the holy Scriptures and the Tradition of the An-

ciis; Legati quoque Hadriani Papa in ejus vicem affuerunt. In hac Synodo Hæresis cujusdam Egiscopi Felicis nomine damnata est. Synodus etiam, quæ ante paucos annos in Constantinopoli congregata est, sub Hirene & Constantino filio ejus septima & universalis appellata est, ut nec septima, nec aliquid diceretur, quasi superuacua ab omnibus abdicata est.

* Tempore Caroli magni Imperatoris, jussu sedis Apostolicæ generalis Synodus in Francia convocante præfato Imperatore celebrata est, & secundum Scripturarum Tramitem Traditionemque majorum ipsa Græca Synodus destructa est & penitus abdicata; de cujus destructione non modicum volumen, quod in Palatio adolescentulus legi, ubi eodem imperatore Romam est per quosdam Episcopos missum. *Hincmar. Rhem. adv. Hincmar. Laudon. cap. 20.*

cients.

“ cients, the Greek Synod was condemned and wholly laid aside. Of the Condemnation whereof a Volume of no small size was sent from the same Emperour to Rome by some of the Bishops, and I my self have read it in the Palace in my younger days.

In the same Chapter he afterwards adds, + Wherefore by the Authority of this Synod, the Worship of Images was somewhat restrained: Yet not so, but that *Adrian* and the other Bishops persevered in their Opinion; and after the Death of *Charles*, most earnestly promoted their Puppet-Worship: Insomuch that *Lewis Charles's* Son, wrote a Book, wherein he fell much sharper upon the Worship of Images than his Father had done.

With what indignation and abhorrence the Decree of the *Nicene Pseudo-Synod* was received by our *British Church*, our Historians tell us. Hear *Roger Hoveden*. * “ *Charles King of France*, sent the Book of the Council, directed to himself from *Constanti-*

+ *Auctoritate itaque huius Synodi non nihil repressa est imaginum veneratio: sed tamen Hadrianus & alii Pontifices in sua opinione perseverarunt; & mortuo Carolo suarum Papparum cultum vehementius promoverunt; adeo ut Ludovicus, Caroli Filius, Libro longè acriori insectatus sit imaginum cultum, quàm Carolus.*

* *Carolus Rex Francorum, misit Synodalem Librum ad Britanniam sibi a Constantinopoli directum, in quo Libro (heu, proh dolor!) multa inconvenientia & vera fidei contraria reperiebantur; maxime quod pene omnium Orientalium Doctorum, non minus quàm trecentorum, vel eo amplius Episcoporum, unanimi assertione confirmatum fuerit, imagines adorari debere, quod omnino Ecclesia Dei execratur. Contra quod scripsit Alcuinus Epistolam ex Auctoritate divinarum Scripturarum mirabiliter assertam, illamque cum eodem Libro, ex persona Episcoporum & Principum nostrorum Regi Francorum attulit. Rog. Hoved. Part I. Annal. ad Ann. 792. Vide & Matth. Westmon. ad Ann. 793.*

nople,

“ *noble, into Britain*; in which Book, alas! alas!
 “ many things were found unagreeable and contrary
 “ to the true Faith; especially, that by the unani-
 “ mous assertion of almost all the Eastern Doctors,
 “ that is to say, of not less than Three hundred or
 “ more Bishops, the Worship of Images was con-
 “ firmed: Which the Church of God utterly abo-
 “ minated. Against which, *Alcuinus* wrote an E-
 “ pistle wonderfully supported with Authorities out
 “ of the Holy Scriptures, and brought it with the
 “ same Book to the King of France, in the Name
 “ of our Bishops and Princes.

From whence it appears, that the *Nicene* Acts
 sent from *Constantinople* to *Charles the Great*, were
 by him before the *Frackford* Synod first sent to *Brit-
 tain*; and being examin'd, and abundantly refu-
 ted, and that from the Holy Scriptures, by our most
 learned *Alcuinus*, were carried back again, together
 with that Refutation of them, to the Emperor in
 the Name of our Bishops and Princes: So that even
then, the *British* Church was *Protestant* in this Ar-
 ticle concerning Image-Worship.

And indeed, I am persuaded that no Man of
 Judgment and Integrity, that hath been conversant
 in the Holy Scriptures, and in the Writings of the
 more ancient Doctors of the Church, will be able to
 read those Acts of the *Pseudo-Synod* of *Nice* with-
 out indignation and abhorrence of it, when he ob-
 serves upon what ridiculous Fables, gross Misinter-
 pretations of Scripture, Falsifications, and imperti-
 nent Allegations of the ancient Fathers, the Bishops
 of that Convention built their Decree concerning
 Image-Worship. Notwithstanding all this, the Bi-
 shops at *Trent* chose to follow that wretched Synod,
 and have decreed, and that as an Article of Faith,
 most firmly to be asserted, *that the Images of Christ
 and the Saints are to be retain'd, yea, and worship'd*

too. May not one presume to ask why? What necessity is there of this? Cannot the Church of Christ be as well without these Images and this Image-Worship now, as it was in the more ancient and purer Times of it? Nay, may we not farther ask, what good use at all can be made of these Images and this Image-Worship? The Answer of the Romanists here is, that these Images are *Libri Laïcorum & Idiotarum*, Books fit to instruct the Ignorant Laity that cannot read the Holy Scriptures, and apt to raise Devotion in them. But to this Plea for Image-Worship, made use of by Wading a Jesuit of Antwerp, his learned Antagonist returns this excellent Answer, with which I shall conclude what I have to say upon this Article: * “ I deny “ not but Images may be of use to the stupid Vulgar,

* Non diffiteor imagines servire posse stupido vulgo, quod non nisi sensibus suis ducitur, ut earum conspectu ad devotionem excitetur, sed vide sis, obsecro, an non multò plura & graviora incommoda metuenda sint, ex usu & cultu earum. Primum enim, fieri vix potest, quin rude & profanum vulgus opiniones fœdas & sordidas de Deo Sanctisque imbibat, ut ex ipsis imaginibus & Statuis tanquam à Diis suis tutelariis pendeat, iis tribuat quæ Gentilium abominationibus paria sunt, si non deteriora; denique istarum imaginum tanquam librorum suorum usu prorsus obbrutescat, quasi aliud quid scire aut sapere opus non habeat. Confirmare hoc possem prolixè, si luberet: sed experientiam solam testem do, quæ omni exceptione major est. Secundo fieri non potest ut per imaginum usum ac cultum non gravissimè offendantur Judæi, & à Religione Christi amplectendâ reddantur alieniores, nimirum piaculum, scelus, aut flagitium summum penè ipsis est Statua aut Imaginis cultus. Messiam esse non posse firmissimè credunt, cujus discipuli tam directe contraria Divina legi licita esse sibi persuadent. Hoc malum tantò pluris æstimandum venit, quòd præcipuum penè est, quòd Judæorum bilem in Christum & Christianos acuit, adèd ut desperata mihi videatur eorum ad Christianam Religionem conversio, quamdiu hic obex ipsis ponitur. Tertio, fieri non potest, ut non offendatur, imò alienissimus non reddatur ab Ecclesiâ vestrà, infinitus Christianorum numerus, qui so-

T
lius

"gar, who are led only by their Senses, for raising
 "their Devotion at the sight of them; but see, I
 "pray thee, whether many more and greater Dis-
 "advantages are not to be feared from the use and
 "worship of them. For in the first place, it is
 "scarce possible, but that the ignorant and prophane
 "Vulgar will be apt hence to imbibe filthy and for-
 "did Notions of God and the Saints, will depend
 "upon these Images and Statues as their Tutelar
 "Gods, will pay them as bad or worse Adoration than
 "the Heathens paid to their Abominations; and, last-
 "ly, will grow mere Brutes by using Images in-
 "stead of Books, as if there were no need of under-
 "standing more than these will teach them. This,
 "were it proper, might be abundantly confirmed:
 "But I only appeal to Experience, as above all Ex-
 "ception. In the next place, it cannot be but the
 "Jews must be most intolerably scandalized at the
 "use and worship of Images, and will be the more
 "averse to all thoughts of ever embracing of Chri-
 "stianity, inasmuch as the worship of a Statue or
 "Image is a dreadful, heinous, and enormous
 "Crime with them. They most firmly believe,
 "that he can never be the *Messias*, whose Disciples
 "allow as lawful what is so directly contrary to the

*lius interditi divini Religione adducti, cultum Imaginum Idola-
 triam sibi esse persuadent: cum ii qui eum urgent, ex praecepto
 divino eum non credant necessarium esse, nihilominus tamen, quan-
 ta possunt vi, eum tanquam necessarium, conscientiis imperant.
 Quanta hac mala & incommoda sint quis non videt? Rudi po-
 pulo datur causa manendi in profano suo stupore; Judeis in fu-
 nesto ipsorum errore; Christianis in deplorando Schismate; piis
 omnibus in aeternâ remedii desperatione. Anne hisce tot, tantisque
 incommodis una ista utilitas, quam ex imaginum usu culatque
 percipi vis, equipolleat, nedum praeponderet, te ipsum judicem
 poscere non dubito. Episcopii Resp. ad Epist. Pct. Wadingi
 de cultu Imag. cap. 8.*

Divine

“ Divine Law. And this is to be reckoned so
 “ much the greater Evil, because it is almost the
 “ principal occasion of all the *Jews* indignation
 “ against Christ and Christians ; so that their Con-
 “ version to our Religion is in my Opinion to be
 “ despaired of, unless this Stumbling-block be first
 “ taken out of the way. Thirdly, Offence will
 “ hereby be inevitably given to an infinite number
 “ of Christians, and they will be irreconcilably
 “ alienated from your Church, whilst having their
 “ Minds possessed with a true sense of the Divine
 “ Prohibition, they think they have just reason to
 “ look upon Image-Worship as no better than
 “ Idolatry : When also at the same time, those
 “ that contend for it do not believe it necessary
 “ by reason of any Divine Command, yet never-
 “ theless press it as much as in them lies upon
 “ Mens Consciences, as though it were necessary.
 “ Who sees not what great Evils and Inconveni-
 “ ences these are? The ignorant People are tempted
 “ to continue in their prophane Sottishness ; the
 “ *Jews* in their destructive Error ; *Christians* in
 “ their deplorable Schism ; and all good Men in
 “ an endless despair of ever seeing an Amendment.
 “ So that I need not fear to make thy self the Judge
 “ between us ; and beg thee to tell me seriously,
 “ whether the single advantage of using and wor-
 “ shipping Images will equal, not to say preponde-
 “ rate, these so many and so great Mischiefs.

The next Article is concerning Papal Indulgences,
 in these words ? † “ I also affirm, that the power
 “ of granting Indulgences was left by Christ to the

† *Indulgentiarum etiam potestatem à Christo in Ecclesiâ re-
 lictam fuisse, illarumque usum Christiano populo, maxime saluta-
 rem esse affirmo.*

“ Church, and the use of them tends very much to
 “ the Salvation of Christians. Now the Doctrine of
 Indulgences, as it was before the Council of *Trent*;
 and hath been since taught in the Church of *Rome*,
 is big with gross Errors. It depends on the Fiction
 of Purgatory; it supposeth a superfluity of the
 Satisfaction of the Saints; which being jumbled to-
 gether (*horreo referens*) with the Merits and Sa-
 tisfaction of our Saviour, make up one Treasury of
 the Church; that the Bishop of *Rome* keeps the
 Key of it, as having the sole power of granting
 Indulgences, either by himself immediately, or by
 others commission'd from him: Lastly, it very ab-
 surdly extends the effect of the power of the Keys,
 left by Christ in his Church, to men in the other
 World. Is not this now a Doctrine worthy of a
 place in our Creed, and to be made an Article of
 the Catholick Faith? That the Doctrine and Use
 of Indulgences were never heard of in the Church of
 Christ for many hundreds of Years, is certain, and
 confessed too by divers learned Men of the Ro-
 man Communion. I shall cite only one of them,
 but he such a one as may be *instar omnium*. Our
Roffensis, *Luther's* great Antagonist and *Rome's* Mar-
 tyr, gives us this Account of Indulgences: “ † Ma-

† Multos fortasse movet indulgentiis non multum fidere quo-
 earum usus in Ecclesiâ videatur fuisse recentior, & admo-
 dum serò repertus apud Christianos. Quibus ego respondeo, non
 certò constare à quo primum tradi ceperunt. De Purgatorio apud
 priscos, nulla vel rarissima fiebat mentio. Sed & Græcis ad hunc
 usque diem, non est creditum Purgatorium esse. Nec tam necessa-
 ria fuit sive Purgatoriû sive indulgentiarum fides in Primitivâ
 Ecclesiâ atque nunc est. Quamdiu nulla fuerat de Purgatorio cu-
 ra, nemo quasivit indulgentias. Nam ex illo pendet omnis In-
 dulgentiarum existimatio. Si tollas Purgatorium, quorsum indul-
 gentiis opuserit? Quum itaque Purga orium, tam serò cognitum,
 ac receptum fuerit universa Ecclesia, quis jam de indulgentiis
 mirari potest, quod in principio nascentis Ecclesiæ nullus fuerit
 earum usus? Act. 18. cont. Lutherum.

“ ny

“ ny perhaps are tempted not to rely much upon
 “ Indulgences, upon this consideration, that the
 “ use of them appears to be new, and very lately
 “ known among Christians. To whom I answer,
 “ It is not very certain who was the first Author of
 “ them. The Doctrine of Purgatory was rarely,
 “ if at all, heard of amongst the Ancients. And
 “ to this very Day, the *Greeks* believe it not.
 “ Nor was the belief either of Purgatory or Indul-
 “ gences so necessary in the Primitive Church as
 “ it is now. So long as Men were unconcerned
 “ about Purgatory, no body enquired after Indul-
 “ gences ; For upon that depends all the worth of
 “ Indulgences. Take away Purgatory, and there
 “ is no more need of these. Seeing therefore Pur-
 “ gatory was so lately known, and received in the
 “ universal Church, who will wonder that in the
 “ first Ages of Christianity Indulgences were not
 “ made use of ?

In this indeed the Bishop seems to be mistaken,
 that he thought the Doctrine of Purgatory and the
 Use of Indulgences to be coeval, and that the lat-
 ter immediately and necessarily follows from the
 former. It is true, Purgatory and Papal Indulgences
 are both of them later Inventions. But I think,
 when Men were first seduced to a belief of Purga-
 tory, they were not yet presently so foolish, as to
 think that any one mortal Man had power by his
 Pardons to deliver Men out of it. Antichristia-
 nism in the *Roman* Church did not presently come
 to that maturity, nor was the Papal Power so soon
 advanced to that prodigious height and greatness.
 It was at first more reasonably judged, that the
 supposed miserable Souls in Purgatory, were to
 receive their relief, rather from the Prayers of the
 Church, together with the Prayers, Almsdeeds,

and good Works of their living Friends and Relations.

To sum up this matter in short: Papal Indulgences, as taught and used in the Church of Rome (to which this Article of the *Trent* Creed must have reference, or else let any Man tell me what the meaning of it is) if they were freely granted, can by no means be justified and defended, but the merchandise and sale of them for Money is abominable. That such a vile trade of Indulgences hath been driven in the Church of Rome, cannot without the greatest Impudence be denyed, as long as the *Taxa + Cancellaria Apostolica* is extant. Of which filthy Book *Espencans* a learned Doctor of the Roman Communion, thus sadly and most justly complains in *Epist. ad Tit. c. 1.* " There * is exposed
" to sale, and easily to be had by any who will
" be at the charge of purchasing it, a Book openly
" and publickly printed here, and which may be
" had now as well as formerly, entituled, *The Tax*
" *of the Apostolical Chamber or Chancery*, whereby

† *Taxa Cancell. Apost. Paris. apud Tass. Denis. 1520.*

* Prostat & in questu pro meretrice sedet liber palam ac publice hic impressus, & hodieque ut olim, venalis, *Taxa Camerae* seu *Cancellaria Apostolica* inscriptus, in quo plus scelerum discas licet, quam in omnibus omnium vitiorum summis & summaris; & plurimis quidem licentia, omnibus autem absolutio emptoribus proposita; parco nominibus, nam quod ait nescio quis

Nomina sunt ipso, pene timenda somno.

Mirum hoc tempore, hoc schismate non suppressum tot tamque facinororum tamque horrendorum scelerum velut indicem adeo infamen, ut non putem in Germania, Helvetia, & ubicunque à Romana sede defectum est opus proflare majore hujus scandalo; adeo tamen non suppressitur ab Ecclesia Romana favissimis, ut talium ac tantorum facinorum impunitates, in facultatibus Legatorum illinc huc venientium, bona ex parte innoventur atque confirmantur.

may

“ may be learned more sorts of Wickedness, than
 “ from all the Summists and the Summaries of
 “ all Vices; and a licence for most of them, but an
 “ absolution for all, is offered to such as will bid
 “ well for it. I spare names, for as one (though
 “ at present I cannot well recollect who) says,
 “ the very repeating of them is offensive. It is
 “ wonderful that during this time and this Schism,
 “ such an infamous kind of Index of so many,
 “ such foul and horrid Wickednesses, that I cannot
 “ imagine any more scandalous work is to be met
 “ with in Germany or Switzerland, or any of those
 “ Countries that have withdrawn their obedience
 “ to the Papal See, should not have been suppressed.
 “ So far have the Factors from the Roman
 “ Communion been from suppressing it, that many
 “ new Impunities for such so gross Enormities
 “ are granted, and the rest confirmed, in the Fa-
 “ culties of the Legates dispatched to their several
 “ Countries. A little after he adds out of *Mantuan*,
 “ ’Tis * sad to see how Money carries all
 “ things at Rome. And not very long before the
 Council of Trent what a prodigious mass of Mo-
 ny Pope Leo raised by these Indulgences, the noble
 Historian *Thuanus* tells us: “ Leo, † saith he to
 “ the guilt of his Dispensations, added another
 “ and greater, when at the instigation of the Car-

* *Hec Roma nunc sola Pecunia regnat*, Mant. Ecl. 9.

† *Peccatum, in sacris muneribus dispensandis Leo graviore cumulavit, cum Laurentii Picii Cardinalis impulsu, pecuniam ad immensos Sumptus undique oerogaret, missis per omnia Christiani orbis regna diplomatibus, quibus omnium delictorum expiationem ac vitam eternam pollicitus est constituto pretio, quod quisque pro peccati gravitate dependerit.* Jac. Thuan. Hist. sui temporis ad ann. 1515.

“ dinal *Laurence Picus*, he every where exacted
 “ Moneys in vast Sums, sending his Bulls through
 “ all the Kingdoms of Christendom, promising
 “ forgiveness of all their Sins and eternal Life, at
 “ a price stated according to the quality of their
 “ Crimes.

In a word, all sober Men cry'd shame at this abominable Cheat, imposed on the Souls of Men for whom Christ dyed. And if the Men that influenced and govern'd the *Trent* Convention, had had any true sense of Religion, they would have denounced an Anathema against this vile Doctrine and Practice, and not (as they have done) decreed, and that as an Article of Faith without any restriction or qualification, “ That * the use of Indulgences is highly conducing to the Salvation of “ Christians. But they were the Pope's Vassals, and received their Instructions from *Rome* not to reform any thing, tho' never so much amiss, that tended to the Grandeur and Gain of that See.

The last Article I shall take notice of is contained in these words: “ I † acknowledge the holy Catholic and Apostolick Roman Church to be the “ Mother and Mistress of all Churches, and promise true obedience to the Pope of *Rome*, Successor to *St. Peter* the Prince of the Apostles, “ and the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Here the Ecclesiastick swears to three great untruths one upon the neck of another. 1. *That the Roman Church is the Mother of all other Churches*; which is a ma-

* *Indulgentiarum usum Christiano populo maxime salutare esse.*

† *Sanctam Catholicam & Apostolicam Romanam Eccl. omnium Ecclesiarum Matrem & Magistram agnosco, Romano Pontifici, Beati Petri, Apostolorum Principis, Successori, ac Jesu Christi Vicario veram obedientiam spondeo.*

nifest falshood in matter of Fact. For every body knows, that the Church of *Jerusalem* was the first Mother Church, and is so called and acknowledged by the ancient Fathers. St. *Jerom* saith, " It * was the Church founded at *Jerusalem*, " that planted all the other Churches. And the Synodical Letters from the Council of *Constantinople* to *Damascus* and the Western Bishops, calls *Cyril* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, which † is the Mother of all Churches. From this truly Mother Church divers other Churches were planted in the *East*, before the Gospel came to *Rome*; as particularly the Church of * *Antioch*, where the Disciples were first called Christians. Upon the Persecution raised against the Church of *Jerusalem*, the Christians of that Church being dispersed and scattered abroad, soon spread the Gospel far and near through the *East*. And to come nearer home, it is affirmed by some learned Men of the Roman Church that our *Britain* receiv'd the Gospel before *Rome*. For † *Suarez* confesseth that the Gospel was preached here from the first rising of it. And *Baronius* from some MSS. in the *Vatican* affixeth our Conversion to Christianity to the 35th Year of our Lord, which was near nine Years before the founding of the Roman Church. But if the credit of these MSS. be questionable, this however is evident, that our *Britain* did not receive her first Christianity from *Rome*, but from the *East*. This, I say, is evident from the Customs observed here from

* *Ecclesia in Hierusalem fundata totius orbis Ecclesias seminavit.* Com. in Is. 2.

† Τῆς μὲν πρώτης ἀπαρχῆς ἐκκλησιῶν, *Theodore's Eccl. Histor.* l. 5. c. 9.

* Act. 11. 26.

† *Defens. Fid. Cath.* l. 1.

the beginning in the observation of *Easter* and the administration of Baptism, different from the *Roman* use but conform to the Oriental Churches. So that we may justly check the arrogance of the present *Roman* Church in the Words of St. Paul to the proud *Corinthians*, setting up among themselves certain Customs, contrary to the Institutes of all other Churches. *Came * the word of God out from you? Or came it to you only?* Q. d. Are you the first and only Christians? Your Church the first and only Church of Christ? Yes, say the *Romanists*, our Church is the Mother of all other Churches. But this is apparently false, for the Law first came out of Sion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. The Church of *Rome* pretends also to be the only Church of Christ, i. e. that there is no true Church of Christ but what is in union with and subjection to her. But this is as false a claim as the other. For there were divers true Churches of Christ, before the Church of *Rome* was in being, which therefore could have no dependence upon her.

2. That the Church of *Rome* is the Mistress of all other Churches is another great Untruth. A proposition which if it should have been advanced in the first Ages of the Church, would have startled all *Christendom*. Every metropolitical Church would presently have stood up, and loudly pleaded her own Immunities, Rights, and Privileges independent upon *Rome* or any other Metropolis. These Rights and Privileges were confirm'd, as of primitive and ancient Custom, by the 6th Canon of the great Council of *Nice*, as hath been before shewn, established also by the 8th Canon of the Oecumenical Council of *Ephesus*, as by and by will appear. Indeed in the days of old, when the Church of *Rome* was quite

* 1 Cor. 14. 36.

another thing from what now it is, all other Churches upon several accounts, paid a singular respect to her, and gave her the Preeminence; but they never acknowledged her Mistressship over them, or themselves to be her Serving-Maids. This Language would then have sounded very harsh, and been esteem'd insolent and arrogant by all the Churches of Christ. In later days indeed she hath made herself Mistress, but a Mistress of mis-rule, disturbing the Peace, invading the Rights, and imposing upon the Faith of other Churches.

3. *That the Bishop of Rome is the Vicar of Christ,* i. e. under Christ the Head and Governour of the Universal Church is another gross untruth. The Universal Pastorship and Jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, over all other Bishops was never heard of, never pretended to by any Bishop of that Church for the first six hundred Years and more, as I have before shewn. To which all that I shall now add concerns our *British* Church. We say then, our Church of *Britain* was never under the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome for the first six hundred Years; *Britain* being a distinct Diocess of the Empire, and consequently having a Primate of her own, independent upon any other Primate or Metropolitan. This appears first from the Customs of our Church during that time, in the observation of *Easter* and the administration of Baptism, different from, as was before observ'd, the *Roman* Custom, but agreeing with the *Asiatick* Churches. For it is altogether incredible that the whole *British* Church should so unanimously have dissented from Rome for so many hundred Years together, if she had been subject to the Jurisdiction of the *Roman* Bishop; or that the *Roman* Bishop all that time should suffer it, if he had had a Patriarchal Power over her.

2. The

2. The same is evident by the unanimous Testimony of our Historians, who tell us that when *Austin* the Monk came into *Britain*, as *St. Gregory's* Legate (which was after the 6th Century was fully compleat and ended) and required submission from our Church to the Bishop of *Rome*, as her Patriarch, the proposal was rejected, as of a new and strange thing never heard of before. The answer of *Dinotus*, the learned Abbot of *Bangor*, in the name of all the *Britons* is famous, viz. " That they knew no obedience due to him whom they called the Pope, but the obedience of Love, and that under God they were governed by the Bishop of *Caerleon*. Under God, *i. e.* immediately, without any foreign Prelate or Patriarch intervening, they were to be governed by the Bishop of *Caerleon*, as their only Primate and Patriarch. Which Privilege continued to the succeeding Bishops of that See for several Ages, saving that the Archiepiscopal Chair was afterwards removed from *Caerleon* to *St. Davids*. And that this was indeed the sense not only of *Dinotus*, but of all the whole Body of our *British* Clergy at that time, all our Historians tell us, witnessing the absolute and unanimous Resolution of the *British* Clergy, both Bishops and Priests, synodically met together, not to subject themselves to the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Rome*. *Vide. Spel. Com. Gual. Mon. l. 2. c. 12. Bedam omnesque alios.*

This being the ancient privilege of the *British* Church, we have an undoubted Right of exemption from the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Rome* by the ancient Canons of the Catholick Church: Particularly by the sixth Canon of the great *Nicene* Council above-mentioned, by which it was decreed, *That the ancient Customs should everywhere obtain, and that the then Privileges of every Province should*

should be preserved inviolate. But this is most evident from the eighth Canon of the Council of *Ephesus*, occasion'd by the famous case of the *Cyprian* Bishops, which was this: The Metropolitan of *Cyprus* being dead (*Troilus* the Bishop of *Constance*) the Bishop of *Antioch* pretended that it belonged to him to ordain their Metropolitan, because *Cyprus* was within the Civil Jurisdiction of the Diocese of *Antioch*. Upon this the *Cyprian* Bishops made their Complaint to the General Council at *Ephesus*, grounding it upon the *Nicene* Canon, and pleading that their Metropolitan had been of ancient time exempt from the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Antioch*, and was ordain'd by a Synod of *Cyprian* Bishops: Which Privilege was not only confirmed to them by the *Ephesine* Council, but a General Decree passed, *That the Rights of every Province should be preserved whole and inviolate, which it had of old, according to the ancient Custom.* And it is to be observed, that the Bishop of *Antioch* had a more colourable Pretence to a Jurisdiction over the *Cyprian* Bishops, than *Gregory* could have to a Jurisdiction over our *British* Churches: For *Cyprus* was indeed within the Civil Jurisdiction of *Antioch*, but our *Britain* was originally it self a distinct Diocese of the Empire. Yet the *Ephesine* Fathers judged, that ancient custom should prevail in the case of the *Cyprian* Bishops; how much more then should it in ours? Certainly Pope *Gregory*, when by his Legate *Austin* he challeng'd to himself a Jurisdiction over our *British Church*, was ignorant of, or had forgotten, or else regarded not the Canons of the *Nicene* and *Ephesine* Councils. If it be objected that our *British Church* afterwards submitted her self to the Bishop of *Rome* as her Patriarch, which Power he enjoy'd for many Ages, and that therefore our first Reformers cannot be excused from

Schism,

Schism, in casting off that Power which by so long a Prescription he was possess'd of; we answer, we did indeed yield our selves to the *Roman* Usurpation, but it was because we could not help it; we were at first forced, awed, and affrighted into this Submission. For, who hath not heard of the barbarous Massacre of the poor innocent Monks of *Bangor*, to the number of twelve hundred, for refusing *Austin's* Proposal, and asserting the ancient Rights and Privileges of the *Britannick* Churches? When this Force ceased, and we were left to our Liberty and Freedom of resuming our Primitive Rights, why might we not do it, as we saw occasion, without the imputation of Schism? This is not only our just Plea, but it is ingenuously confessed by Father *Barns*, our learned Countryman, and of the *Roman* Communion. His words are these:

“ † The Island of *Britain* anciently enjoyed the
 “ same privilege with that of *Cyprus*, that is to
 “ say, of being in subjection to the Laws of no Pa-
 “ triarch: Which Privilege, though heretofore a-
 “ bolished by Tumults and Force of War, yet be-
 “ ing recovered by consent of the whole Kingdom
 “ in *Henry* the Eighth's Reign, seems for Peace-sake
 “ most proper to be retained, so it be done without
 “ breach of Catholick Unity, or incurring the charge
 “ of Schism. Indeed, we had very great Reason
 to resume our Primitive Right and Privilege of
 Exemption from the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of
Rome, when by means thereof he lorded it over

† *Insula autem Britannia gavisæ est olim privilegio Cyprio, ut nullius Patriarchæ legibus subderetur. Hoc autem privilegium etsi abolitum olim fuit bellorum tumultibus &c. vi, tamen cum in tempore Henrici Octavi totius Regni consensu fuerit repetitum; vide-
 tur Pacis ergo retineri debere, sine dispendio Catholicismi, &c. absq;
 Schismatis ullius notâ. Barns. Cath. Rom. Pacif. Sect. 3.*

our

our Faith, and imposed manifest and gross Corruptions both in Doctrine and Worship upon our Consciences. But this by the way. We return to the Article of the *Trent* Creed now before us.

Concerning which it is farther to be observed, that it founds the universal Pastorship of the Bishop of Rome upon a *Divine Right*. It says, the Bishop of Rome is the Vicar of Jesus Christ; i. e. under Christ the Head and Governour of the universal Church. *Quo jure?* He is St. Peter's Successor. What then? Why, St. Peter was constituted by Christ the Prince of the Apostles, i. e. (if there be any connexion of Parts in the Article) he had by Christ committed to him Authority and Jurisdiction over the rest of the Apostles, and consequently over the whole Church.

But the falshood and folly of this pretence hath been manifestly exposed by very many || Writers of our Church: Particularly, that great Man Dr. *Bramhall*, Primate of Ireland, hath sufficiently refuted it in these few words. "Let us consider, saith he;

"*Erst*, That all the Twelve Apostles were equal
" in Mission, equal in Commission, equal in Power,
" equal in Honour, equal in all things, except pri-
" ority of Order, without which no Society can
" well subsist.

" So much * *Bellarmin* confesseth, that by these
" words, *As my Father sent me, so send I you*, our
" Saviour endowed them with all the fulness of
" Power, that mortal Men were capable of. And
" therefore no single Apostle had Jurisdiction over
" the rest, || *Equals have no power over each other*;
" but the whole College of Apostles, to which the

|| *Vide Davenant Determ.* Q. 47.

* *Bell. de Pont.* L. 4. c. 22

|| *Par. in panem non habet potestatem.*

“ supreme

“ supreme Managery of Ecclesiastical Affairs did
 “ belong in common : Whether a new Apostle was
 “ to be ordain’d ; or the Office of Deaconship was
 “ to be erected ; or fit Persons were to be delegated
 “ for the ordering of the Church, as † *Peter* and
 “ *John, Judas* and *Silas* ; or Informations of great
 “ moment were to be heard, as against *Peter* him-
 “ self (tho’ *Peter* out of modesty might condescend
 “ and submit to that, to which he was not obliged
 “ in Duty ; yet it had not become the other Apo-
 “ stles to sit as Judges upon their Superiour, placed
 “ over them by Christ) or whether the weightier
 “ Questions, of the calling of the Gentiles, and
 “ Circumcision, and the Law of *Moses*, were to
 “ be determin’d ; still we find the Supremacy in
 “ the College.

“ *Secondly*, That drowsy Dream, that the pleni-
 “ tude of Ecclesiastical Power and Jurisdiction was
 “ given by Christ to St. *Peter*, as to an ordinary
 “ Pastor, to be derived from him to his Successors,
 “ but to the rest of the Apostles, as Delegates for
 “ term of Life, to die with themselves : As it is
 “ lately and boldly asserted, without Reason, with-
 “ out Authority either Divine or Humane ; so it is
 “ most repugnant to the Doctrine of the Fathers,
 “ who make all Bishops to be the Vicars and Em-
 “ bassadors of Christ (not of the Pope) and Suc-
 “ cessors of the Apostles, indifferently *Vicaria Or-*
 “ *dinatione*, who make but one Episcopacy in the
 “ World, whereof every Bishop hath his share.
 “ St. *Peter* was a Pastor, and the Pastoral Office
 “ is of perpetual necessity in the Church. True ;
 “ but so were all the rest of the Apostles Pastors as
 “ well as he. And if we examine the matter more
 “ narrowly, *cui bono* ? For whose advantage this

† Acts 1. Acts 6. Acts 8, and 15. Acts 11. Acts 15.

“ Distinction

“ Distinction was devised ? It was not for St. *Peter's* own advantage, who (setting aside his
 “ Principality of Order) is confessed to have had
 “ but an equal share of Power with his Fellow Apo-
 “ stles; but for the Pope's Advantage and the Ro-
 “ man Court's, whom they desire to invest solely
 “ with the Key of all Original Jurisdiction.

“ And if we trace on this Argument a little far-
 “ ther, to search out how the Bishop of *Rome* comes
 “ to be St. *Peter's* Heir, *ex asse*; to the exclusion of
 “ his elder Brother the Bishop of *Antioch*, they pro-
 “ duce no Authority that I have seen, but a blind ill-
 “ grounded Legend, out of a counterfeit *Hegesippus*,
 “ of St. *Peter's* being about to leave *Rome*, and
 “ Christ's meeting him upon the way, and admo-
 “ nishing him to return to *Rome*, where he must be
 “ crucified for his Name; which Reason halts on
 “ both sides; the Foundation is Apocryphal, and
 “ the Superstructure is weak and unjointed, without
 “ any necessary connexion.

We have now, I think, sufficiently made good
 our second Charge against the Church of *Rome*, *Viz.*
That she hath changed the Primitive Canon and Rule
of Faith, by adding many new Articles to it; and
those so far from being necessary Articles of Faith,
that they are not Truths, but manifestly erroneous
Propositions repugnant to Reason, Scripture, and the
sense of the Primitive Catholick Church. And yet all
 the Clergy of the Roman Communion are now forced
 not only to subscribe, but in the most solemn manner
 to swear to them. O miserably enslaved Clergy !

There was a time when the *Gallican* Church un-
 derstood her own Liberty, and boldly asserted it, re-
 fusing to own the Authority of the *Trent* Con-
 vention, as being altogether influenced and govern'd by
 the Court of *Rome*. 'Twas a brave Protestation of
 the Embassador of *France*, made in the face of the
 U Council

Council of *Trent*, in the Name of the King his Master and the French Clergy, in these words: * *We refuse to be subject to the Command and Disposition of Pius the Fourth; we reject, refuse, and condemn all the Judgments, Censures, and Decrees of the said Pius. And altho' (most holy Fathers) your Religion, Life, and Learning was ever and ever shall be of great esteem with us; yet seeing indeed you do nothing, but all things are done at Rome rather than at Trent, and the things that are here publish'd are rather the Decrees of Pius the Fourth, than of the Council of Trent; we denounce and protest here before you all, that whatsoever things are decreed and publish'd in this Assembly, by the meer Will and Pleasure of Pius, neither the most Christian King will ever approve, nor the French Clergy ever acknowledge to be the Decrees of a General Council.*

I wish the Gallican Church had still persisted in this Resolution: *Yes* (saith a † great Man of our Church) *so she did, and doth to this Day.* [For tho' she doth not oppose the Council of Trent, but acquiesce, to avoid such Disadvantages as must ensue thereupon, yet she did never admit it.] I should be heartily glad if this were true; but if all the Clergy of France, which represent the French Church, do as well as the Clergy of the other Roman Catholick Dominions, subscribe and swear to the *Trent* Creed (as I suppose they do; and if they did not, I cannot see how they could be accounted within the Communion of the Roman Church) then they admit of the Council of *Trent* with a witness, in its full Extent and La-

* Goldast. Tom. 3. p. 571.

† Bramhall's just Vindication. Tom. 1. p. 128.

titude, as to all its Canons, Decrees, and Definitions, not only which concern Points of Doctrine (as is pretended) but all other which relate to the Discipline and Government of the Church. For this is the last Article of the *Trent* Creed:
 “ * Moreover, what things soever else are delivered, defined, and declared by the Sacred Canons and Oecumenical Councils, and especially by the holy Council of *Trent*, I undoubtedly receive and profess.

SECT. IV. 3. The third and last thing we charge the Church of Rome with, is, *That she hath lamentably corrupted the Primitive Liturgy and Form of Divine Worship.* This was a necessary consequence of the former; so corrupt a Faith could not but produce as corrupt a Worship. To enumerate and represent in their proper Colours all the Corruptions of the Worship of God in the *Roman* Church, would fill a large Volume: I shall therefore only briefly point at some of them. The Prayers of that Church are in a Tongue generally not understood by the People, contrary to Reason, which of it self dictates, that when we pray to God we ought to understand our own Prayers; contrary to the plain Declaration of Scripture, *1 Cor. 14.* contrary to the Practice of the Catholic Church in the first Ages, when Christians every where prayed to God in the Language of their respective Countries, as *Origen* expressly tells us in his Eighth Book against *Celsus*, p. 402. *Iustin Martyr* also, who lived very near the Apostolick

* *Cetera item omnia à Sacris Canonibus & Oecumenicis Conciliis, ac præcipuè à Sacrosanctò Tridentinà Synodo tradita, & declarata, indubitanter recipio atque profiteor.*

Age, informs us, That in the Christian Assemblies of his time there were *Koinai Euxai*, Common Prayers, *i. e.* Prayers wherein all that were present joined in common, and bore a part; and that (as we learn from other very ancient * Authors) by making their *Responses* aloud in due place, and by saying the other Prayers after the Priest or Deacon, *Submissâ voce*. Now there are no such Common Prayers in the Church of *Rome* the Priests say and do all; the People being left to gaze about, or to whisper one to another, or to look upon their private Manuals of Devotion, according as their inclination leads them.

Again, whereas in the first and best Ages the Churches of Christ directed all their Prayers, according to the Scripture, to God only through the alone mediation of Jesus Christ: The Liturgy of the present Church of *Rome* is interspersed with Supplications and Prayers to Angels and Saints, the unwarrantableness whereof I have above sufficiently shewn. To what is there said, I shall only add these two Considerations.

1st, Supposing (not granting) the learned Men of the *Roman* Church could by their subtle Distinctions so refine the Practice of the Invocation of Angels and Saints, as to make it innocent to themselves; yet Experience tells us, that the common People, who understand not those Distinctions, are prone to transgress, and run into sin, and a grievous sin too; in their Practice of it, *viz.* to be taken off in a great degree from that trust and affiance, that entire dependence on Christ, that love and gratitude toward him which they ought to have, and indeed to be more fond of the Saints than of their

* *Vide Cyprian Serm. de Oratione.*

Saviour. It is visible to all Men, with what zeal the silly deluded Souls run to the Shrines of the Saints, how even prodigal they are in their Offerings to them, when in the mean time their Devotion toward their Saviour is very cold, and their Oblations to him sparing and niggardly. This is so manifest, that it hath been confess'd by learned Men of the *Roman* Communion. It is acknowledged by *Biel*, in *Can. Miss. Lect. 30. in Expos. Cant. Mariae*, " * Most of us are more affected towards some Saint, than towards our Lord himself. By our *Halenfis*, *Par. 4. Quest. 26. Memb. 3.* " † Sometimes Sinners are more inclinable to supplicate the Saints, than the Judge. *Cassander* also confesseth, there are Men in the Church of *Rome* (otherwise no ill Men) who trust in their Patron Saints more than in Christ their Redeemer. His words are these: " || There are some, and those no bad Men neither, who have made choice of certain Saints for their Patrons and Guardians, and put more trust in their Merits and Intercession than in the Merits of Christ.

2dly, Whereas it is pretended by some Romanists, especially of late, that their Prayers to Saints amount to no more than an *Ora pro nobis*, a praying or desiring them to pray for us, as we desire the Prayers of one another here on Earth; this is manifestly false. For besides what hath been before observed, that they pray to Saints deceased,

* *Plerique nostrum magis afficimur circa Sanctum aliquem aliquando, quam etiam circa Dominum.*

† *Peccatores ad Sanctorum interpellationem quandoque magis animantur, quam iudicis.*

|| *Homines etiam non mali certos sibi Sanctos tanquam Patronos & tutores delegerunt, atque in eorum meritis atque intercessione, prout quàm Christi meritis fiduciam posuerunt.*

and in a state and place vastly distant from them, wherein they cannot possibly hear their Prayers, unless by Revelation or in *Speculo Trinitatis*, which are groundless Imaginations; I say besides this, divers of their greatest Doctors ingenuously confess, yea, and boldly profess, that they pray to the Saints, as they are appointed by God to be *canales gratiae*, between him and us; Conduit-pipes or Instruments of conveying his Grace to us. So our *Halensis*: “ * Seeing the Divine Grace descends upon us by means of the Saints, it is but fit that our ascent to God be through their Mediation. So their learned Archbishop of *Florence*: “ It † is the Law of the Deity to raise the things below to those that are above, by those in the middle; but as to the gifts of Grace, the Saints stand in the middle betwixt God and such as are travelling towards him. Hence the divine Benefits descend upon us by the mediation of Angels and holy Souls. They say also, that the Saints do procure for us, and convey to us God’s Blessings by the merit of their intercession, and that this is the ground of their praying to them. So again *ubi supra*: “ The † Saints are invoked by us by reason of our want of merit, that where our defects fail, those of others may help us out. So the great Master of the Sentences, *Peter Lombard*: “ We

* *Divinorum Charismatum ad nos per Sanctos fit descensus: unde congruum est, quod ascensus noster ad Deum fiat Sanctis mediatoribus.* Part 4. Quæst. 26. Art. 5.

† *Lex Deitatis est infima per media ad suprema adducere: Quantum vero ad dona gratiae, Beati sunt medii inter Deum & Viatores; divina igitur beneficia ad nos descendant medianibus Angelis & animabus sanctis,* part. 3. tit. 3.

‡ *Sancti invocantur à nobis, propter nostram inopiam in merendo, ut, ubi nostra non suppetant merita, patrocinentur aliena,*

“ * pray

“ * pray them to intercede for us, that is, that
 “ their merits may succour us.

And indeed most of their Prayers to the Saints are so exprest, that they cannot without violence be interpreted to any other sense.

But most extravagant is the invocation and worship of the blessed Virgin, used and practised in the Church of *Rome*. I will not urge here the Hymn in *Cassander's* † time sung in their Churches: “ Beseech || thy Mother, command thy Son, O “ happy Parent, Who makest expiation for our “ Wickedness, by thy Authority as a Mother command the Redeemer. Nor the Psalter of our Lady, mentioned also by *Cassander* *, as that which was in use in his time, in which through the whole Book of Psalms, wheresoever the name of the Lord occur'd, it was changed into the name of our Lady. Tho' I know not whether those horrid Blasphemies were ever censured and condemned by any publick act of the Roman Church.

But I do affirm, that there are still such addresses and forms of Prayer to the blessed Virgin, either enjoyn'd or allow'd by Authority to be used in the Church of *Rome*, as no Man, who hath a due concern for the honour of his Redeemer, can read or hear without abhorrence and detestation. Such is that in † the Office of the Blessed *Mary*, where they thus speak to her “ Hail || Queen, the

* *Oramus, ut intercedant pro nobis, id est, ut merita eorum nobis suffragentur*, Lib. 4. Dist. 45.

† *Cassand. Consult. Art. 21. de Cult. sanct.*

|| *Ora Matrem, jube Filio, | Nostra plains scelera,*
O Felix puerpera, | Jure Matris impera Redemptori.

* *Cassand. ibid.* † *In Officio Beata Maria.*

|| *Salve Regina Mater misericordia: vita, dulcedo, et spes nostra, salve; sub tuum praesidium confugimus nostras deprecationes ne despicias in necessitatibus: Sed à periculis omnibus libera nos semper, Virgo gloriosa.*

„ Mother of Mercy, our Life, Delight, and Hope,
 „ hail ; we shelter our selves under thy Protection,
 „ despise not our Supplications in the times of our
 „ Necessity ; but deliver us from all Dangers, thou
 „ ever glorious Virgin. This is surely more than a
 Pray * for us. For they pray unto her as their
 Life and Hope, and fly to her as their Refuge and
 Protection, beseeching her to deliver them always
 from all Dangers : But chiefly it is to be remark'd
 that she is here called the *Queen and Mother of*
Mercy. Would you know the meaning of this?
Berthorinus will tell you : “ The † truth is, where-
 “ as the Kingdom of God consists in these two Ver-
 “ tues, Justice and Mercy ; God bestow'd on Ma-
 “ ry, the Queen of Paradise, the half part of his
 “ Kingdom, that is, the Mercy. And for this
 “ cause it is she is called the Mother of Mercy.
 The same exposition you may find in *Biel* ||. And
Cassander also acknowledgeth this to be the sense of
 that title given to the Blessed Virgin.

In the Litany of our Lady published in English
 here among us, she is called “ Queen of Angels,
 “ Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles, source of
 “ the fountain of Grace, Refuge of Sinners, Com-
 “ fort of the Afflicted, and Advocate of all Christi-
 “ ans. Now we have no instance of such Attri-
 butes given to the Blessed Virgin, either in the holy
 Scriptures, or in the Writings of the ancient Fa-
 thers ; and indeed they are too big for any mere
 Creature. For here the Government of Heaven and
 all the holy Angels therein, is attributed to her,

* *Ora pro nobis.*

† *Ista est veritas, quod cum Regnum Dei in duobus constet ;*
scil. in iustitia & misericordia, isti Regina Paradisa (Maria)
dimidiam Regni sui partem, scil. misericordiae distributionem con-
sulit Deus. Igitur Regina dicitur Misericordia, lib. 19. Mora-
litarum, cap. 4.

|| *In Can. Missa. Lect. 9.*

which

which belongs only to our Lord Christ || And what do they mean by that title which they give her of *Source* (Scaturigo) of the *Fountain of Grace*? I cannot imagine any other meaning of it, than this, that the Virgin *Mary* receiving first the emanation or efflux of Grace, from God the Fountain of Grace, by and through her, all Grace is carried and conveyed down to all the Faithful. And so indeed *Bernardinus* explains the Matter in these words: “ No
 “ * Creature has obtained any Grace or Vertue
 “ from God, but by the dispensation of this pious
 “ Mother. They that under this Notion address themselves to the Blessed Virgin, surely do much more than desire her to pray for them, as we desire the Prayers of one another.

What do they mean when they say she is the Refuge of Sinners? From what hath been said before, concerning the Kingdom of Mercy supposed to be committed to the Blessed Virgin, and concerning the title of Queen of Mercy given her, we may conclude the sense to be this; that when Sinners are troubled in their Consciences, and terrified with the sense of their Sins, and of the Judgments of God denounced against them, they may and ought to have recourse to her, as the Queen of Mercy, as their *Asylum* and Sanctuary, to shelter and protect them from the divine Vengeance. This a credible Author assures us, hath been represented in several *Roman* Catholick Temples, in which Christ hath been painted with an angry menacing Countenance, casting his darts against Sinners, and the Blessed Virgin interposing her self as *Mediatrix* and repelling his

|| Eph. i. 20, 21, 22.

* *Nulla Creatura aliquam à Domino obtinuit gratiam vel virtutem, nisi secundum ipsius pie Matris dispensationem, Scrm. 61. Art. 1. c. 8.*

Darts.

Darts. But Christ our Lord directs poor guilty Sinners, whose Consciences are oppressed with the burden of their Sins, to a far better Refuge, yea the only Refuge they are to fly to, even to himself. *Come † unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.*

And who can read without the greatest Horrour, such a Prayer to the Blessed Virgin as this that follows? *O my Lady, holy Mary, I recommend my self into thy blessed trust and singular custody, and into the bosom of thy Mercy, this night and evermore, and in the hour of my death, as also my Soul and my Body: And I yield unto thee all my hope and consolation, all my distress and miseries, my life and the end thereof, that by thy most holy intercession and by thy merits, all my works may be directed according to thine and thy Son's will. Amen.* What fuller expressions can we use to declare our absolute affiance, trust, and dependence on the eternal Son of God himself, than they here use in this recommendation to the Virgin? And who observes not, that the will of the Blessed Virgin is expressly joyn'd with the will of her Son, as the rule of our Actions, and that so, as that her will is set in the first place? A smatch of their old blasphemous impiety, in advancing the Mother above the Son, and giving her a commanding power over him. Yet this recommendation to the Blessed Virgin is to be seen in a Manual of Prayers and Litanies printed at *Antwerp* no longer ago than 1671, and that *permissu Superiorum*, appointed to be used in the Evening Prayer for Friday. The Book I had from a near Relation of mine (who had been seduced to the Church of Rome, but afterwards returned again to the Communion of the Church of England) who assured me,

† *Matth.* 11. 28.

that she her self used it, by the direction of her Confessor in her private Devotions.

There was a Book published (and that too *permissu Superiorum*) and in great vogue among our English Roman Catholicks in the Reign of King James the Second, entituled, *Contemplations of the Life and Glory of the holy Mary*. Wherein you may find these words, *God hath by a solemn Covenant pronounced Mary to be the treasury of Wisdom, Grace, and Sanctity under Jesus. So that whatsoever gifts are bestow'd upon us by Jesus, we receive them by the mediation of Mary: No one being gracious to Jesus, who is not devoted to Mary, nor hath any one been specially confident of the Patronage of Mary, who hath not through her received a special blessing from Jesus. Whence it is one great mark of the Predestination of the Elect, to be singularly devoted to Mary, since she hath a full power as a Mother, to obtain of Jesus, whatever he can ask of God the Father, and is comprehended within the Sphere of Man's Predestination to Glory, Redemption from Sin, and Regeneration by Grace. Neither hath any one petitioned Mary, who was refused by Jesus, nor trusted in Mary and was abandoned by Jesus.* Afterwards he tells us, p. 9. *That tho' the condition of some great Sinners may be so deplorable, that all the limited Excellency, Merits, and Power of all the Saints and Angels, cannot effectually bend the Mercies of Jesus to relieve them; yet such is the acceptableness of the Mother of Jesus to Jesus, that whosoever is under the verge of her protection, may confide in her intercessions to Jesus.* There needs no Comment to set forth the horridness of these assertions. Upon the whole matter, I cannot but think those silly Women of *Arabia*, who once a Year offer'd a Cake in honour to the Blessed Virgin as Queen of Heaven, to be as excusable at least as her Devotees in the Church of *Rome*. And yet they

they, in their Days were thought worthy of a place in the Catalogue of Hereticks†. Sure I am most of the Arguments *Epiphanius* useth against the *Colliridians*, may serve every whit as well against the *Papists*.

To pass by the worship of Images, allowed and practised in the Church of *Rome*, of which I have said enough before.

Come we now to the principal part of the Christian Worship, the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist. How lamentably hath the Church of *Rome* vitiated the primitive Institution of that most sacred Rite! She hath taken from the Laity the blessed Cup, contrary to our blessed Saviour's express Command, as expounded by the practice of the Apostles, and of the universal Church of Christ for the first ten Centuries, as hath been above observ'd.

All the learned Advocates of the *Roman Church* with all their Sophistry have not been able to defend her in this matter, from manifest Sacrilege, and a violation of the very Essentials of the Sacrament, as to the Laity administer'd; nor can they prove it so administer'd to be a perfect Sacrament. He that would see this in a short Compass fully proved, and all the weak Evasions of the *Romanists* obviated, may consult our learned Bishop *Davenant* *. Besides, the whole administration of it is so clogg'd, so metaphoriz'd and defac'd by the addition of a multitude of Ceremonies, and those some of them more becoming the Stage, than the Table of our Lord; that if the blessed Apostles were alive, and present at the celebration of the Mass in the *Roman Church*, they would be amaz'd, and wonder what the meaning of it was: Sure I am, they would

† *Heres.* 79.

* *Determ. Quest.* 58.

never own it to be that same Ordinance, which they left to the Churches.

But the worst Ceremony of all is the Elevation of the Host, to be ador'd by the People; as very Christ himself under the appearance of Bread, whole Christ, Θεὸς ἀνθρώπου, God and Man; while they neglect the old *sursum corda*, the lifting up of their Hearts to Heaven, where whole Christ indeed is. A Practice this is, which nothing can excuse from the grossest Idolatry, but their gross stupidity or rather infatuation, in thinking that a piece of Bread can by any means whatsoever or howsoever consecrated and blessed, become their very God and Saviour. A very sad excuse indeed. Moreover by what Reason, by what Scripture, by what Example or practice of the primitive Churches, can the *Romanists* defend their carrying about the holy Sacrament in procession, or the mockery of their solitary Masses? I might pass from the holy Eucharist to the other Sacrament of Baptism, and expose the many strange Ceremonies used in the *Roman* Church in the Consecration of the Font, and in the very Administration of that Sacrament. I might also take notice of the Prayers used by the order of the *Roman* Church in the consecration or blessing of certain inanimate things, for the producing supernatural effects, such as curing Diseases, driving away Devils, &c. without any warrant from Scripture or promise of God, that such Effects shall follow. But I shall stop here.

I have now gone through the several Heads of discourse, which I proposed to my self, and sufficiently I think proved that the Church of *Rome* hath altered the *Primitive Ecclesiastical Government*, changed the *primitive Canon or Rule of Faith*, and lastly miserably corrupted the *primitive Liturgy and Form*

Form of divine Worship. For these reasons laid together, I can never be induced to enter into the Communion of the *Roman Church* as now it is: And for the same Reason (to speak my mind freely) I wonder how so learned a Man as *Monsieur de Meaux* can with a good and quiet Conscience continue in it.

. *Hoc dicit Dominus, stete super vias, & videte, & interrogate de semitis antiquis, qua sit via bona, & ambulate in ea, & invenietis refrigerium animabus vestris, Jer. 6. v. 16.*

The

*The true Notion of the Catholick Church,
in a Letter to the late Bishop of
Meaux, written by the Reverend
Mr. Charles Leslie.*

My Lord,

WE are ready with great Chearfulness to let your Lordship know, what we mean by the Catholick Church.

We do esteem every Bishop, with his College of Presbyters and Deacons, and the Laity of his District, to be a particular Church, wherein the Bishop presides, as representing the Person of Christ, and to be the Principle of Unity in his Church, as St. Ignatius speaks.

And we think with St. Cyprian, (in his 68 Epist. to Pope Stephen, Edit. Oxon.) *Idcirco enim, Frater charissime, copiosum est Corpus Sacerdotum, concordie mutua glutino atque unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut si quis ex Collegio nostro Haresin facere, & Gregem Christi lacerare & vastare tentaverit, subveniant ceteri, & quasi Pastores utiles & misericordes, oves Dominicas in Gregem colligant.* Therefore, most dear Brother, there is a very large Body of Bishops joined together in the Cement of mutual Concord and the Bond of Unity, that if any of our College attempt to make a Schism, and rend and destroy the Flock of Christ, the rest should assist, and like

like good and merciful Pastors reduce the Lord's (wandering) Sheep unto the Flock.

Hence all particular Churches, that is, every Bishop with his proper Flock; make up the whole, which is the Catholick Church.

And all these are one Flock, one Church to Christ, as St. Cyprian speaks, Ep. 55. *Cum sit a Christo una Ecclesia per totum Mundum in multa Membra divisa; ita Episcopatus unus, Episcoporum multorum Concordi Numerositate diffusus.* As there is one Church of Christ distinguished into many Members through the whole World; so there is one Episcopacy of a great united number of many Bishops diffused (through that one Church.) And again, *de Unit. Eccles. Episcopatus unus, cujus a singulis, in solidum, pars tenetur.* There is one Episcopacy, of which part is committed to every Bishop in full. Your Lordship knows, *in solidum* is a Law-phrase, and signifies, that part of this one Episcopacy is so committed to every single Bishop, that he is nevertheless charged with take care of the whole Church.

To maintain and regulate this Concord and Correspondence of the Bishops among themselves, they dispos'd of themselves into Provinces, and chose one Bishop of the Province to preside in their Councils when they met, with some particular Jurisdictions in the intervals, such as they thought fit, for the better Regulation of the whole; but without the infringement of the Power of each Bishop within his own Diocese.

And as every Province of Bishops had such a Metropolitan, so when the several Provinces of one Nation or Kingdom met, they had a Primate or Metropolitan of the whole Nation or Kingdom; still saving the Rights of the particular Metropolitans.

And

And when there should be occasion for the Bishops of several Nations to meet, they had a Patriarch ; still saving the Rights of the particular Primates, Metropolitans, and Bishops, each in their own Districts.

And if the Bishops of several Patriarchates met, the Precedence of these Patriarchs was adjusted, to avoid Contests.

But this Disposition was only among the Bishops of the *Roman Empire*, who might the more conveniently do it, as being all under one Emperor ; and therefore, with his allowance, might meet in any Place of his Empire.

This Empire was call'd *οικουμένη* whence a General Council of the Bishops of the Empire took the Stile of *Oecumenical*.

But there were many great and numerous Churches in *India*, and afterwards in the vast Empire of the *Abyssines* in *Africa*, which not being under the *Roman Empire*, never came to these Councils, nor indeed could come. Neither could they all meet together, having little or no Correspondence together, because of the vast distance and their not being under one Emperor, who might give them safe Conduct, and protect them when together.

The first place among the Patriarchs of the *Roman Empire* was given to the Bishop of *Rome*, that being then the Seat of the Empire.

But sometime after the Seat of the Empire had been translated to *Constantinople*, the Bishop of that See took the Primacy to himself, pretending to be the universal Bishop over the whole Catholick Church. This was the first time that Pretence was ever set up. And your Lordship knows very well the opposition which was given to him in this by *Gregory the Great*, then Bishop of *Rome* ; who told him, that the See of *Rome* had the Preference

X

to

to his in former Councils, and yet that none of his Predecessors, Bishops of *Rome*, did ever assume to themselves such an arrogant Title. He compares the Bishops to the Stars of God, and says, That whosoever sought to advance his Throne above these, did in that imitate the Pride of *Lucifer*, and was the fore-runner of Anti-Christ: And applies this to *John*, then Bishop of *Constantinople*, *Cum se penè per Orbem universum οὐνὺς πῶνόν Patriarcham nominaret*. Here was a *penè*, so that it should seem as if he set himself up only as Head over all the Bishops in the *Roman Empire*. We do believe that your Lordship and the whole *Gallican Church* will readily agree with this Reasoning of the same *Gregory*, that, *Si unus Episcopus vocatur Universalis, Universa Ecclesia corrui, si unus universus cadet*: And he says, *Absit à cordibus Christianorum Nomen istud Blasphemiae, in quo omnium Sacerdotum Honor adimitur, dum ab uno sibi dementer arrogatur*. I refer your Lordship for this, and much more to the same purpose, to his Books of Epistles, *Lib. IV. Ep. 32, 33, 34, 36, 38. Lib. VI. Ep. 24, 28, 30, 39. Lib. VIII. Ep. 30. Lib. XI. Ep. 45.*

And now, my Lord, when we saw such an universal Supremacy set up at *Rome*, which *Gregory the Great* call'd *Blasphemy* and *Madness*; and that enforc'd upon us, as of Faith, the *Summa rei Christianae*, as Cardinal *Bellarmin* calls it, *Pref. ad Lib. de Rom. Pont.* and says. *L. 1. 10. Est enim revera non simplex Error, sed perniciofa Heresis negare B. Petri Primatum à Christo institutum*: And from thence this universal Primacy of the Pope, as Successor to *St. Peter*; was it not time then, my Lord, to stand up against it?

Your illustrious Church has done it as well as we, in your memorable Decrees made in your General Assembly, *An. 1682.* with this difference, That

That you only limit his Supremacy, whereas we have withdrawn our selves from under it. You say there, *Hinc Apostolica potestatis usum moderandum per Canones ——— valere etiam Regulas, Mores, & Instituta à Regno & Ecclesiâ Gallicanâ recepta, Patrumque terminos manere Inconcussos.*

Now we beseech your Lordship to help us to understand, who has power to limit a Supremacy founded by Christ? Do you assert the Liberties of the *Gallican Church*, only as Concessions granted you by the Pope? Or, as your original Rights, and never justly under his power? The latter, I suppose, you stand upon. Then his Supremacy is not absolute. And where shall we find the Limitations? And who is Judge of these Limitations? If any other than the Pope, they are superior to him, who is the supreme.

But then it may be said to us, Why do we not allow to the Patriarch of *Rome* the Dignity of that Primacy, which we own to have been affix'd to his See by the Canons, and consent of so many Bishops?

1. Because he will not be content with it: But claims more, even an universal Supremacy over the whole Catholick Church. And that not *Jure Ecclesiastico* only, from the agreement and consent of his fellow Bishops; but *Jure Divino*, from the immediate Disposition of our Lord Christ; and to that end, quotes several Texts of Scripture, which we think, with the ancient Fathers, infer no such thing.

2. Because he pretends not only to a Primacy of Order, but to an absolute and unlimited Sovereignty over all the Bishops in the World, whom he would have to be his *Subjects*, instead of his *Colleagues*. And this we think does totally subvert that Disposition and Government of the Church,

in which our Lord and his Apostles left it, and as it was understood and practiced in the first and purest Ages. Therefore we think we should be Traitors of the sacred *Depositum*. if we should give way to it, especially considering, That

3. From this Sovereignty and Supremacy, an Infallibility in his Person has been inferr'd, as the only Successor of St. Peter, and Heir of all the Promises and Privileges given unto him, superior to the Authority of all Councils, which derive their Power from him; And to determine of Faith, as well as of Manners, as being the only living Judge of Controversy, always in being; insomuch that Cardinal *Bellarmin* is forc'd to affirm that it is impossible the Pope should err, for this absurdity he says would follow, *Si autem Papa erraret precipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona, Et virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare*, de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 5. And more could not be said of Christ.

4. From all this has been inferr'd an absolute and supreme temporal Power in him, even to depose Princes, and absolve their Subjects from their Allegiance, which is expressly vindicated to him in the 4th Council of *Lateran*, c. 3.

We know, my Lord, that in the *Gallican* Decrees of 1682, this Power of his to excommunicate Kings is absolutely deny'd. As likewise his Infallibility. And he is there subjected to Councils, even to be deposed and excommunicated by them. And his Supremacy is limited, not only by the Canons of Councils, but by the Rules and Orders of every National Church.

But, my Lord, how can this bring us to own his Supremacy, even in the limited sense of the *Gallican* Church, when we know at the same time, that

that he will not submit to it ; nay, that he stood out against it, till the necessity of Affairs pressing your King in the last Confederacy against him, the Bishops of *France* were forc'd to sign a retraction of these Decrees ; till which time the Pope refused to precognize any of their Bishops ? And your Lordship must know better than we do, That it was the Pope who set up the Confederacy against *France*, chiefly upon the point of these Decrees. And the first Article of what was called, *The Resolution of the Princes, Allies, and Confederates, which was taken at the Assembly at the Hague, February 4. 1691.* was in these words, *That no Peace be made with Lewis XIV. till he has made reparation to the Holy See, for whatsoever he has acted against it ; and till he annul and make void all those infamous Proceedings against the holy Father Innocent XI.*

And this was agreeable to the Actings of his Predecessors. Particularly in *France*, whose learned Church always contested their Liberties against the Plenitude of the Papal Supremacy, which sought to swallow them up. And it is very observable, That tho' the Rebellion of the Holy League in *France* lasted during the Reigns of six Popes, every one of these Popes was for the League against the King. And Cardinal *Cajetan* Legate there for the Pope, in the Year 1593, made this his main Argument to justify that Rebellion, that so many Popes had concurr'd in it. This we are told by *D'Avila* in his History of the Civil Wars of *France*, Lib. 13. But I will trouble your Lordship no farther with Instances of Popes fomenting Rebellions of Subjects against their Natural Princes, and their deposing of Kings, on pretence of this their Universal Supremacy. These things are well known to your Lordship. And we do believe, That the whole *Gallican* Church does abhor and detest such Doctrines.

But, my Lord, we do thus judge, That if the Pope will not be content with that Supremacy of Order, which was given to him, *jure* only *Ecclesiastico*, and as the first of the Patriarchs within the *Roman* Empire; but will assume a Supremacy over the whole Catholick Church, even of all Churches which never yet did own his Supremacy over them:

And withal will turn this Supremacy of Order into an absolute and despotick Sovereignty, Temporal as well as Spiritual; with an Infallibility of Decision in himself, in all matters of Faith as well as Morals: And having practised all this for many Ages, and been supported in it by the learned Writers of his side, as well as countenanc'd in it, at least, by several Councils of his calling; and will not to this day be brought to disown any of these pretences; nor to acknowledge that he has receiv'd this his Supremacy from any Ecclesiastical Establishment of his Fellow-Bishops: But asserts it as of Divine Right, and therefore unlimitable and indefeasible: My Lord, we then judge, That he has truly forfeited that Ecclesiastical Primacy given to him by the Canons. As if a Judge, the General of an Army, or President of the King's Council, should disown the King or any Authority from him, and set himself up as King, and assume the Regal Stile, it would be Treason in any to adhere longer to him, or to obey him on pretence of the Commission he formerly had from the King.

My Lord, we think it incumbent upon every Bishop of the Church to assert his own inherent Power given to him by our Lord, and to restore the Discipline of the primitive Church, which leaves him supreme in his own Diocese, not hurt or infring'd in the least by the Regulations made among the Bishops themselves, for their mutual
Correspondence

Correspondence and Management of the Affairs of the Episcopal College. We consider with St. Cyprian, Ep. 73. *Quàm periculosum sit in Divinis rebus, ut quis cedat Jure suo & Potestate.*

I am inclinable to believe, That if your Lordship in particular and other Bishops of the Gallican Church were at liberty, each in his own District, to regulate such Matters as you might do with a good Conscience, things might be brought to bear so, from such a happy beginning of Reformation; as that tho' Men might differ in some particular Opinions, as they always will, yet that terms of Communion might be adjusted between us, upon Catholick Principles, to the Honour of God and Peace of his Church. And if such a Communion were begun, tho' but with a few Bishops, who would exert their just Power, it might bring the Church to that State in time, in which all good Men wish to see her. And if a Catholick Communion were restor'd, we should see again the primitive face of the Church. But no Step can be made towards this, while the Pope's Supremacy ties up the Power of all other Bishops in their own respective Churches. And we hardly expect, that he will give any way to any thing that will in the least infringe the Plenitude of his Supremacy. You have made an Experiment of it in your General Assembly of 1682. And if he will not suffer his Supremacy to be limited and reduc'd to the Standard of the ancient Canons, we can see no remedy, my Lord, but that it must be taken away. Why should we have any hesitation to take that out of the way, which is the visible *Remora* to the uniting of all Christian Churches, and the restoring of Catholick Communion all the World over? To take that out of the way, which your Bishops of France, as well as those

of the *Greek Church* and ours in *England*, are fully convinc'd is an Usurpation? Against which you have often struggled, and still do complain. But we have thrown it off, seeing no other way possible to get from under its Usurpation.

My Lord, I am satisfied that your Church and ours are nearer to one another, as to this Point of the Supremacy, than you are with the Church, at least with the Court of *Rome*.

We see, my Lord, the Peace of the World better consulted by the Divine Providence, in many independent Kings, than in one universal Monarch: Whose Deputies, in far distant Regions, could never be kept from Revolts, as we have seen in great Monarchies, tho' none was ever yet universal. And betwixt a King and his Rebels, there is no interposing by his Subjects, it would justly render such suspected who should argue on the Rebels side. Therefore the end must be extermination of the one or the other. Whereas in Disputes betwixt Kings, other Kings may interpose their Mediation, and become Guarantees of Peace.

And yet the whole World is one Kingdom to God, as it is written, *Psal. xxi. 29. Domini est Regnum, & ipse dominabitur Gentium.* How vain then would the Dispute be betwixt any of these Nations, suppose *France, Spain, or England*, which of them were this one Kingdom, when each of them, tho' greater than any other Kingdom of the Earth, would still be but a part of this one Kingdom?

Such, my Lord, we esteem the Dispute to be betwixt particular Churches; which of them is the Catholick Church? We must say, None of them; tho' one be much greater and more potent than another, yet it is still but a part of the whole.

And

And as God has appointed no universal Monarch, neither has he an universal Bishop. And all the Arguments which an universal Bishop could use for Unity and Peace, and to end Controversies, might be us'd by an universal Monarch; and both prove equally fallacious, to the greater Disturbance rather than Settlement of that Peace.

But as our Faith is dearer to us than our Lives, so the Mischief would be greater, if the whole Church should be made to depend upon one; for then, *Universa Ecclesia corrui, si unus Universus cadit*. And if the Church falls, the Faith which is built upon it must fall with it. This oblig'd the Pope's when they set up for Universality, to assert Infallibility to themselves likewise; because indeed less than that could not support so vast a Charge, as that of the whole Catholick Church. But since their Infallibility is fallen, at least in *France*, we think it strange that their Universality should survive it. An Universality which never yet was in Fact! never own'd by the Catholick Church, or any Churches out of the Bounds of the Western Empire; nor intended, when first us'd in the Western Councils, to extend any farther.

How much safer has Christ consulted for his Church, than to put it all into the hands of one fallible Man! *Iccirco copiosum fecit Corpus Sacerdotum, ut si unus lacerare & vastare tentaverit, ceteri subveniant*; as in the case of *Paulus Samosatenus*. Thus the Peace of the World is preserv'd, and thus the Peace of the Church. And thus it is that God has disposed of both; whose Foolishness is wiser than Men.

But your Lordship asks, how these several Churches can be that Kingdom of Jesus Christ, not divided in it self, and which can never fail? My Lord,
our

our blessed Saviour has told us, That there will be Divisions in his Church: And the Experience of all Ages has made it good. But if the meaning be, That Schismatics and Hereticks, who go out of the Church, are no longer of it; and so the Church, that is, those who remain, are not divided; in this sense no Church can be divided, if but three or four were left. But, is a Church divided, when there is a Schism within her own Bowels; and Bishops and Anti-Bishops set up among those who are otherwise of the same Communion, Doctrine, and Worship? Your Lordship knows very well (without referring you to *Platina*) how many Schisms of this sort have been in the Church of *Rome* from the time of *Cornelius* and *Novatian*, Popes and Anti-Popes set up against one another, and some of them lasting for many Years together.

But if Schism does not divide a Church, then, my Lord, you have clear'd us, as to any Schisms among us, at the same time that you vindicate the Church of *Rome*: But with this difference, That where the whole Authority of a Church is center'd in one, as the supreme Head and Principle of Unity to all the Bishops and Churches which compose that one Church; there a Schism concerning such an universal Head when several such Heads are set up together, in opposition to one another, must be much more fatal to the Unity of that Church; than where such a Dispute falls out amongst co-ordinate and independent Bishops, united only in a Metropolitan or Primate of their own Option; and subjected to such Rules as are concerted among them, for the better regulation of their common Body. These two Cases are as different as a Division in our House of Lords or Commons; who should be their *President* or *Speaker*, wou'd differ from

from a Division of the Nation, who shou'd be their King: To set up another King is Treason; not so of a Speaker, or the President of any Court. A Metropolitan is but President of the Court of Bishops, chosen by themselves. But the Pope pretends to be King and Supreme: And two *Popes* are two *Kings* of the Church.

But now, my Lord, if all the Kingdoms in the World make one Kingdom to God, without any universal Vicar or Monarch under him, why should it be difficult to apprehend how all the Christian Churches make one Church to Christ without any universal Bishop?

The Bishops, who are the Stars of God, (*Apoc.* 1. 20.) and Princes of his Church, are, by the Rules of Catholick Communion (observ'd in the Primitive Church, and which it is wish'd by all good Christians were restor'd) *Concordiæ mutue glutino atque unitatis vinculo copulati*, more than the temporal Princes of the World are: Each of whose Power and Authority reaches no farther than the extent of his own Dominions; his Sentence, whether of Death, Confiscation, &c. has no effect elsewhere. But by the Rules of Catholick Discipline, the Sentence of every Bishop in his own Church has its Effect all the Christian World over; and every Bishop is oblig'd to maintain the Rights and Jurisdiction of every other Bishop: So that any Person justly excommunicated by his proper Bishop, stands excommunicated from all other Bishops and Churches, and consequently from the Catholick Church; and when absolv'd by his own Bishop, is thereby restor'd to the Peace and Communion of the Catholick Church. Because the whole Catholick Church is one Flock, in the Language of St. Cyprian, who says, *Ep. 67. Nam et si Pastores multi sumus, unum tamen Gregem pascimus,*

mus, & oves universas. For though we be many Pastors, yet we feed one and the same Flock, in general all the Sheep (of Christ.) And, Ep. 55. *Singulis Pastoribus portio Gregis adscripta est, quam regat unusquisque & gubernet.* A share of the Flock, which every one is to rule and govern; is committed severally to single Pastors. And the difference of Discipline among Bishops, each in his own Diocese, does not at all break this Unity; concerning which he says, Ep. 72. *Ceterum scimus quosdam quod semel imbibierint, nolle deponere, nec Propositum suum facile mutare; sed salvo inter Collegas pacis ac Concordie vinculo, quadam propria, qua apud se semel sint usurpata, retinere. Quâ in re, nec nos vim cuiquam facimus, aut legem damus; cum habeat in Ecclesia administratione, voluntatis suae Liberum Arbitrium unusquisque Præpositus, rationem sui Actus Domino redditurus.* But we know, that some will never part with what they have once imbibed, nor change their Opinion, but keeping the Bond of Peace and Concord among their Colleagues, will retain some of their own Practices, which they have once used. In which case, neither do we use unreasonable violence towards any, or give Laws to others, because every Bishop hath free liberty of acting according to his own Will in the Administration of the Church, as one who is to give an account of his own acting to the Lord. And therefore leaving every Bishop to the full Government of his own Diocese, according to his own Will, only, *Salvo inter Collegas Pacis ac Concordie vinculo*, he impos'd not any thing by way of any Authority he had, upon any of the Bishops whom he call'd to Council at Carthage; but said, *Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se Episcoporum constituit.* Neither doth any of us make himself a Bishop of Bishops. He assum'd no more than as President of that College of Bishops, without thinking

thinking he had Power to interpose in the Government of any Bishop within his own Diocese.

It is said in the History of your *Henry the Great of France*, that he had it in his Thoughts to have erected a *regal College* of all the Christian Kings in *Europe*, by the consent of all the Kings, wherein all Differences among them shou'd be adjusted by common consent, and whoso refus'd to stand to the Decision of that College, shou'd be compell'd by the rest. But this was only to determin of Differences among the several Kings, not to prescribe Laws for any King in his own Dominions: Nor did it give the President (whatever King shou'd be chosen President of that College,) any power whatever in any of the other Kings Dominions. And if he should assert it, and claim to be universal Monarch over all these Kingdoms, upon the account of his being President of the Regal College, it wou'd be a manifest Usurpation, and ought to be oppos'd by all of these Kings, who shou'd no longer own him even as President: And his Arguments for Unity, and that all shou'd submit to him for Peace-sake, wou'd be very ridiculous.

That which your *Henry the Great* wish'd and endeavour'd to bring to pass, as to the greater Unity of Kings, was in great measure effected in the General Councils of the Bishops, within the compass of the *Roman Empire* in purer times; and might still be farther, in Councils more general, as the Commerce of the World encreases, if the Supremacy of one did not hinder all others to attempt it.

Upon the whole, we think, That as all the Kingdoms of the World are one Kingdom to God; so, that the several Churches, which, according to the Primitive Constitution, are much more united than the Principalities of the Earth, may
be

be justly term'd one Catholick Church ; and that without one universal Head or Sovereign upon Earth, which, as I have said, was never yet in Fact ; and if it were, wou'd be of fatal consequence to the Faith, and Unity of the Church, and that Frame in which our Blessed Lord and his Apostles left it.

And upon this pretended Sovereignty of the Pope, we charge the Schism of those who have broke off from the subjection to their proper Bishops: For Calvin himself says, *Talem si nobis Hierarchiam exhibeant, in qua sic emineant Episcopi, ut Christo subesse non recusent, Et ab illo tanquam Unico Capite pendeant*—*Tum vero nullo non Anathemate dignos fatear si qui erunt qui non eam revereantur, summæque obedientiæ observent.* (De Necessit. Eccles. Reformand.) And Beza says, *Si qui sunt (quod sana mihi non facile persuaseris) qui omnem Episcoporum Ordinem Rejiciant, absit ut quisquam satis sana mentis furoribus illorum assentiatur.* (Bez. ad Tract. de Minister. Evang. ab Hadrian. Sarav. Belgæ Edit. c. 1.) And says as to the Episcopacy of the Church of England, (*ibid.* c. 18.) *Fruatur sana ista singulari Die providentiâ; Et utinam sit illi perpetua.*

From hence, others have proceeded to throw off Episcopacy it self: But we see from what Spring all these have flow'd. And from the Disease we discover the Remedy, which is, To restore the *Episcopatus vigorem*, the *Sacerdotii sublime fastigium*, as St. Cyprian calls the Power of every Bishop in his own District: Of which, St. Ignatius and the first Fathers spoke such great things without so much as a Hint of the Sovereignty of one Bishop over the rest ; which was a Notion not known in those Ages.

We

We think the Divine and Apostolick Authority of the Episcopate swallow'd up at Rome, in the Sovereignty of the Pontificate: As the learn'd Arch-Bishop of Spalato, *Marc. Anton. de Dom.* did observe, and in his *Consilium Professionis*, gave it as the reason of his leaving that Communion, and joining himself to a Church where Episcopacy was Free and Primitive.

My Lord, what we plead for is the Restoration of the Original Rights of Episcopacy in the Roman Communion: Where, tho' the Name is retain'd, yet the Power is swallow'd up in one. Without whom, none of the other Bishops have the freedom of their own Judgments left to them, or dare not exert it.

We shou'd then think the time for healing of Schism and unity of the Church approaching, if the Bishops in her Communion wou'd think themselves at liberty, wou'd be persuaded that it was their Duty, as answerable to God, to exert the full of their Apostolical Authority, each in his own Diocese; where, as St. Cyprian says, *Eph. 59. Juxta Vice Christi cogitatur: He is to be esteem'd as a Judge in the place of Christ.* And, *Ep. 69.* That he ought *Cathedram sibi constituere, & Primatum assumere.* And, *Ep. 68.* speaks of the Bishops in general, as *Gubernanda Ecclesie Libram tenentes: Holding the balance of Church Government.* If we cou'd treat with your Lordship in this stile, and say with him, *Ep. 3. Cum pro Episcopatus vigore, & Cathedrae Auctoritate, habere. Potestatem;* if you wou'd bear such Language from us, we should hope a good Effect: We might then come to understand one another better than we have done. But if your Lordship think not your self at liberty to make any Reformation in your own Diocese, even in things which you cou'd not only allow, but might

might desire were done; and which might have so blessed an Effect, as the beginning of a Catholick Communion: We must then say, with the great Father before nam'd, *Ep. 59. Si ita res est—Actum est de Episcopatus vigore.*

But leaving all this to the good time and disposition of Providence, I shall think my self happy, and my Pains abundantly recompenc'd, if I may have afforded to a Man of your Lordship's Character, Learning, and Sagacity, any clearer view of our Notions of the Catholick Church, than from your unacquaintedness with our Writings have come to your Lordship's knowledge before.

I beg your Lordship's patience for one word more, as to what your Lordship says concerning *the infallible Assistance of the Holy Ghost in the Council of Nice, and consequently in all such Assemblies of the same Church.* My Lord, we know of no such Promise particularly apply'd to Councils; nor to any particular Church: Several of whose Candle-sticks have been remov'd, and others may. We doubt not the Assistance of God's Holy Spirit to every Man and Assemblies of Men, who seek his Glory with an unfeigned Heart. But this Grace may be resisted by Assemblies, as well as by private Men. Witness the second Council of *Ephesus*, and, as we maintain, the second Council of *Nice*.

My Lord, neither you nor we think, that Councils can add any one Article to the Creed, or take any away. But upon the arising of any new Heresy, a Council is the best Evidence of the Faith receiv'd in those Churches of which it is compos'd. Thus they are Witnesses and Guards of the Faith, but neither the Authors or Masters of it.

There never yet was, nor we believe ever will be (and we think it not necessary that there shou'd be) a Council compos'd of Bishops deputed from
all

all the Christian Churches in the World. And none other can be call'd truly universal.

But, blessed be God, all retain the Foundation and Summary of our Faith, that is, The Apostles Creed, as explain'd by the Council of *Nice*. And tho' some differ in the sense of some Parts of it, yet they are not to be convinc'd by majority of Votes in a Council; but by laying before them the Primitive Doctrine, built upon the Holy Scriptures, and sufficiently attested and witnessed in the first and after Ages of the Church. And to shew the beginning and rise of Heresies; and that they were not from the beginning. So *Alexander*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, proceeded against *Arius*, by asking the Bishops assembled in Council, *Quis unquam talia audivit?* And all declaring that they had never heard of such a Doctrine before; it was therefore novel; and so to be rejected: Not from the Authority of the Council, but their undeniable Testimony, witnessed by all their Flocks, who constantly heard their Doctrine.

Every Bishop, as supreme in his own Church, and a Council of Bishops assembled may condemn such an Heresy, and forbid Communion with such and such, or not, as they shall find it most expedient for the saving of their own Flocks, and the general good of the Catholick Church. For this is Matter of Discipline. And in this they have Authority, to which their Flocks ought to submit: And this they may alter, retain, or relax, according to the variation of Times and Circumstances. But the Faith they cannot alter, only bear witness to it; therefore in Matters of Faith they have no Authority, properly speaking: For Example, they have no Authority to determine, Whether there be a God, or not? Whether Christ is come in the Flesh? Whether he dy'd for the Sins of Men?

Y

Whe-

Whether the Holy Scriptures are true? Whether we ought to receive the Creed? Their Negative in any of these Points must be detested by all Christians. And these are the highest Points of Faith, wherein they have no Authority, can determine nothing by their Authority, cannot make use of that Topick to convince any Gain-sayer. For no Bishop or Council of Bishops can have any Authority, but upon the supposition of a God, a Christ, of the Truth of the Holy Scriptures, whence they prove their Authority. And therefore none of these can stand upon their Authority. But the Church does bear witness to the Truth, and preaches, and preserves that Faith which was once deliver'd to the Saints; and in this sense, is the Pillar and Ground of the Truth, as the supporters and propagators of it, not the Authors of it, or having dominion over it. To convince us in which, it has pleas'd God to permit Councils, even those who have call'd themselves Oecumenical, to fall into gross Errors, as the fourth of *Lateran*, that enacted the deposing Doctrine, which both the *Gallican* and *English* Church think to be damnable, according to *Rom. xiii. 2*. And not only so, but Oecumenical Councils have oppos'd and contradicted one another, have censur'd and condemn'd each other, as the second Council of *Ephesus* was condemn'd by the fourth General Council at *Chalcedon*.

Besides, the Dispute is not yet determin'd in the Church of *Rome*, where that Infallibility of which your Lordship speaks, is plac'd: Whether in the Pope alone, as the only Successor of *St. Peter*, and Heir of the Promises made to him, of *Super hanc Petram — Tibi dabo Claves, &c.* as *Bellarmin* and the *Canonists* and *Schoolmen* have contended? Or, whether in a Council, as superior to the Pope, according to the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*?

Or,

Or, whether in neither of them separate, but only in both together? Or lastly (because of many Objections even in that Scheme, some Popes and Councils having been against others) Whether this Infallibility is to be look'd for only in the Church diffusive, as some of their Writers do assert? This Uncertainty must render this Infallibility utterly uncertain: Seeing it is the same, not to have a thing, as not to know where to find it. And none can embrace any one of these Schemes of Infallibility, but he must oppose all the others; and consequently the greatest part (it may happen) of the Church of *Rome*, because there are so many odds against them. For none can hold to more than one of these Schemes, they being all so opposite to one another, that if any one of them be true, all the rest must be false. And, according to *Bel-larmin* (as before quoted) heretical, as overthrowing the very *Summa rei Christianae*.

And now, my Lord, you cannot think it strange, That we should be at a loss about this Infallibility, when there is so great variety and even contradiction among those who do assert it.

But tho' we think no Church to be infallible, yet we have an infallible Assurance of the Faith, in its being delivered down to us by such an universal Consent of all Ages and Churches, as that it was not in their power, tho' they should be supposed so wicked as to design it, at such vast distance, even where all Correspondence was stopp'd, to have combin'd together, and all agree in the self-same Doctrine, if it had not been the same which had been taught them from the beginning. And the rise of Heresies does rather confirm the truth of this; because such were found to be Novelties, and to go against this universal Tradition: Which whatever has, according to the Rule of *Vin-*

centius Lirinensis, Quod semper, ubique, & ab omnibus, we willingly receive; and what has not this Evidence, we cannot admit as of Faith.

We rest fully satisfy'd and assured of Christ's Promise, That he will always preserve a Church to himself upon Earth (tho' there is no Promise to *Rome, England*, or any particular Church) against which the Gates of Hell shall not finally prevail. But we are told, That they will be permitted to make great inroads upon her, and she is represented to us as persecuted in the Wilderness at some times.

God grant we may see her Restauration. And I am confident your Lordship will join with us in this Prayer, That the *ὁ καλίστων* (whoever or whatever it is) *ἐκ μίσεως ἡμῶν*. Amen.

Sept. 26. 1703.

A Letter

*A Letter to an English Priest of the
Roman Communion at Rome.*

I Should not so long have neglected answering your obliging Lines of the 30th of Sept. last; if I had not expected the happiness of your good Company here at *Florence*; the Postscript of your Letter led me into this Error, and *Don John* my Lord Cardinal's Cup-bearer confirm'd me in it, and 'tis but lately I have been undeceiv'd. I am glad you had such Satisfaction from your Journey to *Naples*: I don't question the truth of that matter of Fact of which you affirm your self to have been an eye-witness; yet I cannot apprehend, how you can be assured that the *Substance which you saw in the glass Vial hard and dry like reddish Earth, and which you might have crumbled with your Fingers, was, when liquified, Blood*; nor yet less that it was the Blood of *St. Januarius Bishop of Benevent, martyr'd in the time of Dioclesian*, as you are pleas'd to affirm in your Letter. But I wonder most how you can pretend to be convinc'd with perfect evidence of sense, that there was no human Artifice in this. The relation that your senses gave you, was only that upon the contact of the Silver Case wherein is supposed to be deposited the Head of the same Saint, the dry matter like reddish Earth liquified, and became soft like a cake of Blood; now all this may be true, and yet the whole business an Imposture. For one ought to examine what causes there may be in natural things capable to produce

Y 3

the

the same effect, and upon what Authority this supposed Miracle is established ; for certainly you will not say, there has never been any false Miracles pretended to in the Church of Rome. Therefore I conclude that the evidence of sense you had in this case, could not be a perfect conviction to you, that you was not imposed upon by the Subtily of others. I will not make any advantage of that disparagement you often put upon the evidence of sense in other cases, and consequently weaken the strength of its assurance ; but I think the inference you draw from the whole as lame, as the former Assertion, viz. *That 'twas God alone did it, who one Day will make dead Bones and dead Blood live* ; for Miracles, when true, are not always the immediate effect of divine Power, and Angels both good and bad may do such things as exceed any natural Power known to us. I am sure the Scripture tells us that the *working of Satan is with all Power, and Signs, and lying Wonders*, and where the love of the truth is not received, *God will send strong delusions that they should believe a Lye*. I am not much concerned for the reflection you make upon our Church for want of Miracles ; 'twas the same thing in the time of St. Chrysostom, who in his sixth *Homily* upon the *first Epistle* to the *Corinthians*, shews the necessity and usefulness of them for the establishing Christianity, which being once effected, 'twas rather necessary they should cease than continue ; for if Miracles were always visible, Faith would have less merit, and consequently less reward. I am thoroughly satisfied, that the Christian Religion was confirm'd by the Miracles of our Saviour and his Apostles, which tho' they were not in that great abundance nor upon such trivial occasions, as are those produced by the *Roman Church*, yet they will much better bear the test of a strict examination,

tion, and carry greater evidences of their Divinity. As for the proof of negatives, I govern my self by St. Paul's rule, that *if any pervert the Gospel of Christ, or that he or an Angel from Heaven should preach any other Gospel, let them be accursed.* This is the sure word of Prophecy, whereunto you would do well to take heed, as unto a light, that shineth in a dark place.

I would not be thought to detract, from the virtue of Faith, for without it 'tis impossible to please God; tho' I cannot but observe that you mistake St. Paul, when you make him say, *that tho' we give all we have to the Poor, yet without Faith it avails nothing.* 'Tis to Charity he gives such a high encomium in that Chapter; and lest Christians should lay too great a stress upon their Orthodoxy in believing, he adds that *tho' one has all Faith, so that he could remove Mountains, and have no Charity, he is nothing.* The parting with all one has, and the laying down one's very Life, the two great instances our Saviour gives of the perfection of his Doctrine, are not sufficient without this noble Virtue. This is that more excellent way the Apostle shew'd unto the *Corinthians*, and which he desired them earnestly to covet.

I would not have you mistake me therefore; I assure you, I no more take the Court of Rome, than I do the Roman Church, for the Catholick Church. But being, when at Rome, at the head, as you suppose, of Unity, one may be thought likelier to get some knowledge of the Body there, than in a pestilential northern Air, and this was all I pretended to; if you persist to think otherways, I submit.

I have carefully considered what you say about *Infallibility*, and I cannot find you have in the least shaken the evidence of my Proposition, viz. *That Infallibility, the ground of all your Delusions, has no Foundation*

foundation either in holy Scriptures or primitive Antiquity. 'Tis like a House built upon a Rock, that can bear the attacks of the greatest subtilty, and can receive no prejudice from the artificial attempts that are made to destroy it. You ask me, *How I am persuaded of this?* 'Tis only by having examined Scripture and Antiquity, both which I find silent concerning this point. At the same time I own my self to be a Man, which implies a Creature subject to error, & *nihil humani à me alienum esse puto*; therefore you have no reason to assent to what I propose, till you have made the same tryal. And tho' I am not so unjust as to be angry with you for suspecting me to be in the wrong, yet it would have been much better for you to have proved it, than only to mistrust it; for your Letter brings no conviction of the interest that Doctrine of *Infallibility* has either in Scripture or Antiquity. All you quote from the one is our Saviour's promise of *being with his Disciples to the end of the World.* And *why should we think, say you, he would be with them, but to preserve them from error?* All that you urge from the other, is the *liberty the ancient Councils took of making their Definitions Articles of Faith*; as, *that Christ is Consubstantial with the Father, &c.* which Creed we own and receive, and therefore consequently you infer we ought to embrace the *Infallibility* of the Church. To both I will give you as plain and short answers as I can, & *valeant quantum valere possint.* As to the Promise of our Saviour, which we find recorded in the 28th of St. Matth. 19, 20. *Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo I am with you always, even to the end of the World:* All that can reasonably be drawn from this

this Text is, that the Christian Church shall be always existent to the end of the World. Tho' if it were positive for its Infallibility, as it is for its existence, yet before it would do you any good, you must prove, that by *you*, is meant *you*, and *only you*, of the Church of *Rome*; that Christ has obliged himself not only to give sufficient means of direction, but that he will necessitate Men to follow them, and that he will not only preserve them from all damnable Errors, but also from all erroneous Doctrines. Yet if this were granted, which you cannot expect from me; if the promise here be absolute, every one who has power to preach and baptize, might claim infallible assistance by vertue of it; and so every Parish Priest would have as good a title to Infallibility as the Pope and a General Council. 'Tis certain there is no difficulty in believing, that God could have promised to his Church a total preservation from error; as it is Blasphemy to say he would not have made it good, if he had promised it. But our Question is whether he has promised it or no? Not what God is capable of doing? But what God has really and actually done? If you object I interpret Scripture by my own private reason which is liable to error, I would feign know a better method of proceeding, as long as the infallible Interpreter is the Controversy in debate.

I think the proof you bring from *Antiquity*, makes as little to the purpose as that you have brought from the Scripture; for where is the consequence, that a General Council has explained an Article of Faith and that this explanation has been received by the Catholick Church, *ergo*, the Church of *Rome* is Infallible. We receive the determinations of the *Council of Nice*, because they are agreeable to Scripture and to the sentiments of the *Fathers*, both of the *Greek* and *Latin* Church, which preceded

ceded that General Council. We reject the determinations of the Council of *Ariminum*, because they are contrary to both. So that our receiving them does not depend upon the opinion of their infallibility. They never arrogated this privilege to themselves ; for if they had pretended to it, they could not have neglected to have settled a matter of such importance as the foundation of all their proceedings, their silence in this case is worth a thousand Arguments ; for who can think it could be their interest to have concealed so great a Treasure ? And lest in time great inconveniences might happen by pretending to explicate the Articles of Faith, and by inserting those explications in the Creed ; one of the first four General Councils, I think 'tis that of *Ephesus* (tho' I am not positive, for I have not Books by me to clear it) made a Decree, which prohibited the farther enlarging of the Creed by any additional explications, foreseeing those Mischiefs which latter Ages have felt, and with which particularly the Council of *Trent* has burthened us.

I am not ignorant, that two of your great Champions, Cardinal *Perron* and *Petavius*, to raise the Authority of General Councils, and to make the rule of their Faith appear more plausible, have aspersed not only the Holy Scriptures as incapable, by reason of their obscurity, to prove the great and necessary point of our Saviour's Divinity ; but have also impeached the Fathers of the first three Centuries as tardy in the same point, whose Writings they say, touching this important Article, *Cum Orthodoxæ Fidei regula minime consentiunt*. Blessed God ! that Men should be so fond of humane Inventions, as to sacrifice to them those Pillars of our Faith, which are alone proper and able to support it, I mean Scripture and primitive Antiquity. But to do justice to the memory of so learned a Man as

Petavius,

Potavins, the Bishop of *Meaux* told me, discoursing with him once on this Subject, that in the last Edition he made of his Works, he retracted this opinion, which I am willing to believe upon the Authority of that great Man, whose admirable Talents as well as particular Favours challenge a great deal of respect and esteem from me, which I shall always pay him, tho' he is an Adversary to the Religion I profess. By this judge what pitiful Shifts your great *Goliaths* have been reduced to, when they have found themselves oppress'd by the weight of Truth. Christ's being consubstantial with the Father was believ'd long before the Council of *Nice*; 'twas no new Doctrine invented by them, but only declared by them, to be and to have been the belief of the Church. You have hinted at the great Advantages of the Doctrine of *Infallibility* in order to the suppressing of Schisms and Heresies, but they are only so in speculation. Your Church it self does not think it sufficient for that purpose; or else she is very uncharitable to make use of the severer method of an Inquisition, and upon all occasions to call for the assistance of the temporal Sword, as the surest means to suppress them. No, he that is disposed in mind to receive the decisions of any Church as infallible without judging of them, is much likelier to fall into Heresy, than he who thinks all such Determinations must be examined by Scripture and primitive Antiquity; since by this privilege the Pope and his Faction challenge, of interpreting God's Laws without Error, 'tis easy for them to impose what they please, the power of making Laws and the sole Power of interpreting them being much akin. You add one thing more, that no Protestant can deny but *that the State of the Church would be much better in being secured from Error in her Decisions, and therefore we cannot*

not think but that Christ who did all things well, would do that which is best for his Church. I think it is much safer arguing the contrary way, that Christ has not established any such Power, and that therefore it is not best for the State of the Church. The Ground of your assertion is too presumptuous, that what seems fit to human Reason, should seem fit to the infallible Judgment of God. 'Tis our Duty to be thankful for those means God has left us to work out our Salvation; and not to conclude he hath done that which he hath not done, because our shallow Capacities judge it fit to be done. But what art thou, O Man, that objectest against God !

Christ has left us such excellent Precepts of Modesty, Humility, Patience, Christian Forbearance, and Charity, that the practice of them would make us much sooner agree than any new method you can propose; at least if we do not agree, they will inspire us with such a noble temper, as heartily to compassionate one another, to live amicably and friendly together, and not be pulling out one anothers Eyes, because we do not see things the same way. This is that in which I would have always different Parties zealous, for there is nothing wanting very often to extinguish ill will, but an opportunity for Men to converse lovingly together, by which they will quickly perceive they are not such Monsters, as they are represented to one another at a distance.

This I endeavour, according to my weakness, to practice my self; this I inculcate into all my Friends; that if we cannot agree in our Opinions, yet to take care that they do not rob us of our Charity and Love of one another, which in the sight of God is of great price.

You

-You see, what a long Letter you have drawn upon your self; it would have been disrespectful to you, as well as to Truth, to have neglected an Answer, and therefore I don't think my self oblig'd to make any Apology. Tho' if you had known how much I have been surfeited with Controversies upon a melancholy Occasion, you would accept of this small attempt as a favour. I am,

S I R,

Your Faithful Humble Servant.

Florence, 26.

Dec. 1690.

R. NELSON.

F I N I S.

APPENDIX.

P A P. I.

Mr. Herbert Thorndike's Judgment of the Church of Rome, as it was deliver'd by him in a Paper to a Lady a little before his Death, taken from the printed Copy in the 85th page of a Book intituled, Several Conferences between a Romish Priest, a Fanatick Chaplain, and a Divine of the Church of England, &c. London, printed 1679.

1. **T**HE truth of the Christian Religion and of the Scripture is presupposed to the Being of a Church.

And therefore cannot depend upon the Authority of it.

2. The Church of Rome maintains the Decrees of the present Church to be infallible, which is false, and yet concerns the Salvation of all that believe it.

Therefore no Man can submit to the Authority of it.

3. The

A P P E N D I X.

3. The *Church of Rome* in *St. Jerom's* time, did not make void the Baptism of those Sects which did not baptize in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

But that *Baptism* is void, and true Baptism necessary to Salvation.

Therefore the *Church of Rome* may err in matters of Salvation.

4. The *Church of Rome* may err in *Schism*, following the wrong cause. If you except only things necessary to Salvation to be believed. This shews, that *Infallibility* only in things necessary to Salvation is not enough. It is destructive to Salvation to follow the wrong Cause in *Schism*.

Instance. The *Schism* with the *Greek Church* for Appeals to *Rome*. For there is evident Tradition to the contrary.

5. The *Church of Rome* enjoyns *Apocryphal Scriptures* to be esteemed *Canonical Scriptures*.

But this Injunction is contrary to Tradition and Truth, and concerns the Salvation of all that receive it.

6. The *Church of Rome* in *St. Jerom's* time did not receive the *Epistle to the Hebrews* for *Canonical Scripture*, as now it doth, and as in truth it is.

Therefore the *Church of Rome* may err in declaring the Authority of Scripture.

7. The *Church of Rome* doth err in teaching that attrition is turn'd into contrition by submitting to the Power of the Keys;

But this Error is destructive to the Salvation of all that believe it.

Therefore it may err in matters necessary to Salvation.

That it is an Error. Because of the condition of Remission of Sins, which is before the Being

A P P E N D I X.

Being of a Church; and therefore cannot depend on the Authority of the Church.

8. The *Church of Rome* enjoyneth to believe *Transubstantiation*, and to profess that which is false. For there is Scripture and Tradition for the presence of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* in the *Eucharist*; but neither *Scripture* nor *Tradition* for *Transubstantiation*, viz. for abolishing the *Elements*.

But the *Church of Rome* enjoyns to believe it.

Therefore it enjoyns to believe that, for which there is neither *Tradition* nor *Scripture*. Witness the *Fathers* that own the *Elements* after Consecration.

9. The *Council of Trent* enjoyneth to believe that *Christ* instituted a new *Passover* to be sacrificed as well as represented, commemorated, and offered in the *Eucharist*; *de Sacrific. Missæ, cap. 1.* which is false:

For the *Sacrifice* of *Christ's Cross* is commemorated, represented, and offered as ready to be slain in and by the *Eucharist*; but not slain, and therefore not sacrific'd in it and celebrating it. And therefore when it is said there, c. II. *Quod in Missa Christus incruentè immolatur*, if it be meant properly, it is a *contradiction*; for that which hath Blood is not sacrificed but by shedding the Blood of it; if *figuratively*, it signifies no more than that which I have said, that it is represented, commemorated, and offered as slain:

And therefore all parts agreeing to this, the *Church of Rome* requiring more is guilty of the *Schism*; that comes by refusing it. For the propitiation of the *Sacrifice* of the *Eucharist* is the propitiation of *Christ's Cross* purchased for them that are qualified.

10. The

A P P E N D I X.

10. The *Council of Trent* commends the Mass without the Communion, *cap. 6.* wherein it erreth, For the Communion being the restoring of the Covenant of Baptism after sin, the want of it without the desire of it is to be lamented, not commended; as destructive of the means of Salvation.

11. There is neither Scripture nor Tradition for praying to Saints departed, nor any evidence that they hear our Prayers.

Therefore it evidences a carnal Hope, that God will abate of the Covenant of our Baptism, which is the condition of our Salvation, for their sakes.

12. To pray to them for those things which only God can give (as all *Papists* do) is by the proper sense of their words downright Idolatry.

If they say their meaning is by a figure only to desire them to procure their requests of God; How dare any Christian trust his Soul with that Church, which teaches that which must needs be Idolatry in all that understand not the Figure?

13. There is neither Scripture nor Tradition for worshipping the *Cross*, the *Images* and *Reliques* of *Saints*,

Therefore it evidences the same carnal Hope, that God will abate of his Gospel for such Bribes. Which is the Will-Worship of *Masses*, *Pilgrimages*, and *Indulgences* to that purpose.

14. Neither Scripture nor Tradition is there for the removing any Soul out of *Purgatory* unto the *Beatifical Vision* before the day of *Judgment*.

Therefore the same carnal Hope is seen in the Will-worship of *Masses*, *Indulgences*, *Pilgrimages*, and the like for that purpose: And that

A P P E N D I X.

that destructive to the Salvation of all that believe that the guilt of their Sins is taken away by submitting to the *Keys* before they be contrite ; and the temporal penalty remaining in *Purgatory* paid by these *Will-worships*.

15. Both *Scripture* and *Tradition* condemn the *deposing of Princes*, and acquitting their Subjects of their *Allegiance*, and enjoying them to take *Arms* for them whom the *Pope* substitutes.

And this Doctrine is not only false, but in my Opinion properly *Heresy*, yet practiced by so many *Popes*.

The Church may be divided, that *Salvation* may be had on both sides.

Instances. The *Schisms* of the *Popes*. The *Schism* of *Acacius*. The *Schism* between the *Greeks* and the *Latins*.

I hold the *Schism* for the *Reformation* to be of this kind.

But I do not allow *Salvation* to any that shall change, having these Reasons before him ; tho' I allow the *Reformation* not to be perfect in some points of less moment, as *prayer for the dead*, and others.

Remember always that the *Popish Church* of *England* can never be Canonically governed being immediately under the *Pope*.

16. There is both *Scripture* and *Tradition* for the *Scriptures* and *Service* in a *known Tongue* ; and for the *Eucharist* in both *kinds*.

How then can any Christian trust his Soul with that *Church*, which hath the conscience to bar him of such helps provided by God ?

A P P E N D I X.

P A P. II.

Mr. Chillingworth's * *Letter of the Infallibility of the Church of Rome, or of that Doctrine which teaches the Roman Church to be the Guide of Faith, taken from the printed Copy in the Preface to a Book entituled, Certamen Religiosum, or a Dispute between a Papist and a Protestant, &c. Oxford, printed 1704.*

S I R,

GIVE me leave to think it strange, and not far from a Prodigy, That this Doctrine of the *Roman Church* being the *Guide of Faith* (if it be true Doctrine) should not either be known to the *Four Evangelists*; or if it were known to them, that being wise and good Men, they should either be so envious of the Church's Happiness, or so forgetful of the Work they took in hand (which was to write the whole Gospel of *Christ*) as that not so much as One of them should mention, so much as once, this so necessary a part of the Gospel, without the belief whereof there is no Salvation, and with the belief whereof (unless Men are snatch'd away by sudden Death) there can

* See also his Discourses against the Infallibility of the Roman Church among the additional Discourses of Mr. Chillingworth printed at the end of his Works, in 4to. 1687.

A P P E N D I X.

hardly be any Damnation. It is evident, they do all of them speak with one consent very plainly in many things of small importance in comparison thereof, and is it credible (or indeed possible) that without Consent or rather a Conspiracy, they should be so deeply silent concerning this *Unum Necessarium*, One Thing Necessary? You may believe it, if you can; for my part I cannot, unless I see demonstration for it. For if you say, they send us to the Church, and consequently to the Church of *Rome*, this is to suppose that which can never be proved, That the Church of *Rome* is the only Church; and without this supposal upon any Division of the Church, I am as far to seek for a Guide of my Faith as ever. As for Example, In the great Division of the Church, when the whole World wondered (saith St. *Ferom*) that it was become *Arian*, when *Liberius* Bishop of *Rome* (as St. *Athanasius*, St. *Ferom*, and St. *Hilary* testify) subscribed to the Heresy, and joined in Communion with them; Or in the Division of the *Greek* and *Roman* Churches; about the Procession of the Holy Ghost, when either side was the Church to it self, and each Heretical and Schismatical to the other: What direction could I, an ignorant Man, have then found from that Text of Scripture (*Unless he hear the Church, let him be unto him as an Heathen and a Publican*) or (*Upon this Rock will I build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.*) Again, Give me leave to wonder, that neither St. *Paul* writing to the *Romans* should not so much as intimate this their Privilege of *Infallibility*, but rather on the contrary put them in fear (in the 11th Chap.) *That they as well as the Jews, are in danger of falling away.* That St. *Peter*, the pretended Doctor of *Rome*, writing two *Catholic* Epistles mentioning his departure, should not so much

A P P E N D I X.

much as *once* acquaint the Christians, whom he writes to, what *Guide* they were to follow after he was taken away. That all the Writers of the *New Testament* should so frequently forewarn Men of *Hereticks*, *false Christs*, and *false Prophets*, and not arm them *once* with letting them know this only sure means of avoiding them. That so great a part of the *New Testament* should be employed about *Antichrist*, and so little or indeed none at all about the *Vicar of Christ* and *Guide of the Faithful*. That our Saviour should leave this only means of ending Controversies, and yet speak so obscurely and ambiguously of it, that now our *Judge* or *Guide* is become the greatest Controversy, and hinderance of ending them. That there should be better Evidence in Scripture to entitle the *King* to this Office, who disclaims, than the *Pope*, who pretends to it. That *St. Peter* should never exercise any *one* act of Jurisdiction over the Apostles, nor they ever give him *one* Title or Authority over them. That if the Apostles did know, that *St. Peter* was made *Head* of them, when our Saviour said (*Thou art Peter*, &c.) they should still contend, who should be the First; and that our Saviour should never tell them, that *Peter* was the Man. That *St. Paul* should say, *He was in nothing inferior to the chief Apostles*. That the *Catechumenists* in the primitive Church should never be taught this Foundation of their Faith, *That the Church of Rome was the Guide of it*. That the Fathers *Tertullian*, *St. Jerom*, and *Optatus*, when they flew highest in Commendation of the *Roman Church*, should attribute no more to Her, than to all other *Apostolical Churches*. That in the Controversy about *Easter*, the Bishops and Churches of *Asia* should be so ill catechiz'd, as not to know this Principle of Christian Religion, *The necessity of Conformity*

A P P E N D I X.

in Doctrine with the Church of Rome; nor should ever be press'd with any such Conformity in all things, but only with the particular Tradition of the *Western Churches*. That *Irenæus* and many other Bishops (notwithstanding *ad hanc Ecclesiam necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam*) should not yet think it necessary Doctrine, or a sufficient ground of *Excommunication*, which the Church of Rome thought to be so. That St. *Cyprian* and the Bishops of *Africa* should be so ill instructed in their Faith, as not to know this Foundation of it: That they likewise were never urged with any such Necessity of Conformity with the Church of Rome, nor ever charged with Heresy or Error, for denying it. That when *Liberius* joyn'd with the *Arians* in Communion, and subscribed to their Heresy, the *Arians* should not then be the Church and Guide of Faith. That never Hereticks, for Five Ages after Christ, were press'd with this Argument of the *Infallibility* of the Church of Rome; or charged with the denial of it, as a distinct Heresy; so that *Aeneas Sylvius* should have cause to say, *Ante tempora Concilii Niceni quisque sibi vivebat, & parvus respectus habebatur ad Ecclesiam Romanam*. That the Ecclesiastical Story of those Times mentions no Acts of Authority of the Church of Rome over other Churches; as if there should be a *Monarchy*, and the King for some Ages together exercise no Jurisdiction in it. That to supply this defect, the *Decretal Epistles* should be so impudently forg'd, which in a manner speak nothing else but *Reges & Monarchas*, I mean the Pope's making Laws for, and exercising Authority over all other Churches. That *Vincentius Lirinensis* seeking for a Guide of his Faith and a Preservative from Heresy, should be so ignorant of this so ready a one, *The Infallibility of the Church of Rome*. Nay, that the Popes themselves

A P P E N D I X.

selves should be so ignorant of the true ground of this their Authority, as to pretend to it, not upon Scripture and Universal Tradition, but upon a pretended imaginary hint of such a Canon of the Council of *Nice*.

All these things and many more are very strange to me, if the *Infallibility* of the Church of *Rome* be indeed, and was always acknowledg'd by Christians, The *Foundation* of our *Faith*. And therefore I beseech you pardon me, if I choose to build mine upon One that is much firmer and safer, and lies open to none of these Objections, which is *Scripture* and *Universal Tradition*. And if one that is of this *Faith* may have leave to do so, I will subscribe myself

Your loving and true Friend,

CHILLINGWORTH.

Z 4

P A P. III.

APPENDIX.

P A P. III.

The Creed of Pope Pius IV.

After having recited the Nicene Creed,
the following Articles are thus con-
tinued, viz.

13. **A** Postolicas & Ec-
clesiasticas Tra-
ditiones, reliquasque e-
jusdem Ecclesie observa-
tiones, & constitutiones
firmissime admitto & am-
plector.

14. *Item Sacram Scrip-
turam juxta eum sen-
sum, quem tenuit & te-
net Sancta Mater Eccle-
sia, cujus est judicare
de vero sensu & in-
terpretatione Sacrarum
Scripturarum, admitto;
nec eam unquam, nisi
juxta unanimem consen-
sum Patrum, accipiam &
interpretabor.*

15. *Profiteor quoque
septem esse verè & pro-
priè Sacramenta novæ
legis à Jesu Christo Do-
mino nostro instituta, at-
que ad salutem humani
generis,*

13. **I** Most firmly re-
ceive and em-
brace, the Apostolical
and Ecclesiastical Tradi-
tions, and all the other
Observances and Con-
stitutions of the same
Church.

14. I do receive the
Holy Scriptures in the
same sense that Holy
Mother Church doth,
and always hath, to
whom it belongs to
judge of the true sense
and interpretation of
them; neither will I
receive and interpret
them otherways, than
according to the unani-
mous consent of the Fa-
thers.

15. I do also profess,
that there are seven Sa-
craments of the new
Law truly and properly
so called, instituted by
our Lord Jesus Christ,
and

A P P E N D I X.

generis, licet non omnia singulis, necessaria; scilicet, Baptismum, Confirmationem, Eucharistiam, Penitentiam, Extremam Unctionem, Ordinem & Matrimonium, illaque gratiam conferre; & ex his Baptismum, Confirmationem & Ordinem sine Sacrilegio reiterari non posse. Receptos quoque & approbatos Ecclesie Catholice Ritus, in sacramentorum omnium Administratione, recipio & admitto.

16. *Omnia & singula, quae de peccato Originali & de Justificatione in Sacro-Sancta Tridentina Synodo definita & declarata fuerunt, amplector & recipio.*

17. *Prostector pariter in Missa offerri Deo verum, proprium & propitiatorium Sacrificium pro vivis & defunctis, atque in sanctissimo Eucharistiae Sacramento esse verum, realiter & substantialiter Corpus & Sanguinem,*

and necessary to the Salvation of Mankind, though not all of them to every one, viz. Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Marriage, and that they do confer Grace; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, may not be repeated without Sacrilege. I do also receive and admit the received and approved Rites of the Catholick Church in the solemn Administration of the above-said Sacraments.

16. I do embrace and receive all and every thing, that hath been defined and declared by the holy Council of Trent, concerning Original Sin and Justification.

17. I do also profess, that in the Mass there is offered a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the Quick and the Dead; and that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly, really,

A P P E N D I X.

*guinem, unà cum Animâ
 Et Divinitate Domini
 Nostri Jesu Christi;
 fierique conversionem to-
 tius substantiæ panis in
 Corpus, Et totius sub-
 stantiæ Vini in Sangui-
 nem; quam conversio-
 nem Catholica Ecclesia
 Transubstantiationem ap-
 pellat.*

18. *Fateor etiam sub
 alterâ tantum Specie,
 totum atque integrum
 Christum verumque Sa-
 cramentum sumi.*

19. *Constanter teneo
 Purgatorium esse, ani-
 māsque ibi detentas fi-
 delium Suffragiis juvari.*

20. *Similiter Et San-
 ctos un. cum Christo reg-
 nantes, venerandos atque
 invocandos esse, ebsque
 Orationes Deo pro no-
 bis offerre, atque eo-
 rum reliquias esse vene-
 randas.*

21. Fir-

and substantially, the
 Body and Blood, toge-
 ther with the Soul and
 Divinity of our Lord
 Jesus Christ; and that
 there is a change made
 of the whole substance
 of Bread into the Body,
 and of the whole sub-
 stance of Wine into the
 Blood; which change
 the Catholick Church
 calls Transubstantiation.

18. I confess also,
 that under one Kind
 only, whole and entire
 Christ, and a true Sacra-
 ment, is taken and re-
 ceived.

19. I do firmly hold,
 that there is a Purgato-
 ry, and that the Souls
 there detained are re-
 lieved by the Suffrages
 of the Faithful.

20. I do likewise be-
 lieve, that the Saints
 reigning together with
 Christ, are to be wor-
 shipped and prayed un-
 to; and that they do of-
 fer Prayers unto God
 for us, and that their
 Relicks are to be had
 in veneration.

21. I do

APPENDIX.

21. *Firmissimè assero, Imagines Christi, ac Dei paræ semper Virginis, necnon aliorum Sanctorum habendas & retinendas esse; atque eis debitum honorem ac venerationem impertiendam.*

22. *Indulgentiarum etiam potestatem à Christo in Ecclesiâ relictam fuisse, illarumque usum Christiano populo maximè salutarem esse, affirmo.*

23. *Sanctam Catholicam & Apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam, omnium Ecclesiarum Matrem & Magistram agnosco; Romanq; Pontifici, Beati Petri, Apostolorum Principis, ac Jesu Christi Vicario, veram obedientiam spondeo ac juro.*

24. *Cetera item omnia à sacris Canonibus, & œcumenicis Conciliis, ac præcipuè à sacrosanctâ Tridentinâ Synodo tradita, definita & declarata indubitanter recipio*

21. I do most firmly assert, that the Images of Christ, and of the ever Virgin Mother of God, and of the other Saints, ought to be had and retained; and that due Honour and Veneration ought to be given to them.

22. I do affirm, that the power of Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is very beneficial to Christian People.

23. I do acknowledge, the holy Catholic and Apostolick Roman Church to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; and I do promise and swear true obdience to the Bishop of Rome, the Successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

24. I do also without the least doubt, receive and profess all other things which have been delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons and œcumenical Councils,

APPENDIX.

recipio atque profiteor; simulque contraria omnia atque Hereses quas cunque ab Ecclesia damnatas, rejeclas, & anathematizatas, ego pariter damno, rejicio, & anathematizo. Hanc veram Catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, quam in presenti sponte profiteor, & veraciter teneo, eandem integram & inviolatam, usque ad extremum vita spiritum constantissime (Deo adjuvante) retineri & confiteri, atque a meis subditis, vel illis quorum cura ad me in manere meo spectabit, teneri, doceri & predicari, quantum in me erit, curaturum, ego idem N. spondeo, voveo, ac juro. Sic me Deus adjuvet & hac Sancta Dei Evangelia.

Councils, and especially by the holy Synod of Trent; and all things contrary thereunto, and all Heresies whatsoever condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the Church, I do likewise condemn, reject, and anathematize. This true Catholick Faith, without which no Man can be saved, which at this time I freely profess and truly embrace, I will be careful (by the help of God) that the same be retained and firmly professed whole and inviolate, as long as I live; and that as much as in me lies, that it be held, taught, and preach'd by those under my power, and by such as I shall have charge over in my Profession. I the said N. promise, vow and swear: So help me God, and these his holy Gospels.

P A P.

APPENDIX.

PAP. IV.

A Paper concerning the Differences in the chief Points of Religion betwixt the Church of Rome and the Church of England, written to the late Countess of Peterborough, by Dr. John Cosins, afterwards Lord Bishop of Durham.

The Differences in the chief Points of Religion between the Roman Catholicks and us of the Church of England; together with the Agreements which we for our parts profess and are ready to embrace, if they for theirs were as ready to accord with us in the same.

THE DIFFERENCES.

WE that profess the Catholick Faith and Religion in the Church of England, do not agree with the *Roman* Catholicks in any thing whereunto they now endeavour to convert us. But we totally dissent from them (as they do from the Ancient Catholick Church) in these points.

1. That the Church of *Rome* is the Mother and Mistress of all other Churches in the World.

2. That the Pope of *Rome* is the Vicar-General of Christ: Or that he hath an Universal Jurisdiction over all Christians that shall be saved.

3. That

A P P E N D I X.

3. That either the Synod of *Trent* was a General Council; or that all the Canons thereof are to be receiv'd as Matters of Catholick Faith under pain of Damnation.

4. That Christ hath instituted seven true and proper Sacraments in the New Testament, neither more nor less, all conferring Grace, and all necessary to Salvation.

5. That the Priests offer up our Saviour in the Mass, as a real, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and the dead; and that whosoever believes it not, is eternally damn'd.

6. That in the Sacrament of the Eucharist the whole substance of Bread is converted into the substance of Christ's Body, and the whole substance of Wine into his Blood, so truly and properly, as that after Consecration there is neither any Bread nor Wine remaining there, which they call Transubstantiation, and impose upon all Persons under pain of Damnation to be believed.

7. That the Communion under one kind is sufficient and lawful (notwithstanding the Institution of Christ under both) and that whosoever believes or holds otherwise, is damned.

8. That there is a Purgatory after this Life, wherein the Souls of the dead are punished, and from whence they are fetch'd out by the Prayers and Offerings of the Living: And that there is no Salvation possibly to be had by any that will not believe as much.

9. That all the old Saints departed, and all those dead Men and Women, whom the Pope hath of late canonized for Saints, or shall hereafter do so, whosoever they be, are and ought to be invoked by the Religious Prayers and Devotions of all Persons; and that they who do not believe this as an Article of their Catholick Faith, cannot be saved.

10. That

A P P E N D I X.

10. That the Reliques of all these true or reputed Saints ought to be religiously worshipped; and that whosoever holdeth the contrary, is damned.

11. That the Images of Christ, and the blessed Virgin, and of the other Saints, ought not only to be had and retained, but likewise to be honoured and worshipped, according to the use and practices of the *Roman Church*; and that this is to be believed as of necessity to Salvation.

12. That the power and use of Indulgences, as they are now practiced in the Church of *Rome*, both for the Living and the Dead, is to be received and held of all under pain of eternal Perdition.

13. That all the Ceremonies used by the *Roman Church* in the Administration of the Sacrament (such as are Spittle and Salt in Baptism, the five Crosses upon the Altars and Sacrament of the Eucharist, the holding of that Sacrament over the Priest's head to be adored, the exposing of it in their Churches to be worshipped by the People, the circumgestation and carrying of it abroad in Procession upon their *Corpus Christi* day and to their sick for the same, the Oyl and Chrism in Confirmation, the anointing of the Ears, the Eyes, and Noses, the Hands, and Reins of those that are ready to dye; the giving of an empty Chalice and Paten to them that are to be ordained Priests, and many others of this nature now in use with them) are of necessity to Salvation, to be approved and admitted by all other Churches.

14. That all the Ecclesiastical Observations and Constitutions of the same Church (such as are their Laws of forbidding all Priests to marry; the appointing of several Orders of Monks, Friars, and Nuns in the Church; the Service of God in an unknown Tongue; the saying of a number
of

A P P E N D I X.

of *Ave Maria's* by tale upon their Chaplets ; the sprinkling of themselves and the dead Bodies with Holy Water, as operative and effectual to the Remission of venial Sins ; the distinctions of Meats to be held for true Fasting ; the religious Consecration and incensing of Images ; the baptizing of Bels ; the dedicating of divers Holydays for the immaculate Conception and the bodily Assumption of the blessed Virgin, and for *Corpus Christi*, or Transubstantiation of the Sacrament ; the making of the *Apocryphal* Books to be as Canonical, as any of the rest of the holy and undoubted Scriptures ; the keeping of those Scriptures from the free use and reading of the People ; the approving of their own *Latin* Translation only ; and divers other matters of the like nature) are to be approved, held, and believed as needful to Salvation ; and that whoever approves them not, is out of the Catholick Church, and must be damned.

All which, in their several respects, we hold some to be pernicious, some unnecessary, many false, and many fond, and none of them to be imposed upon any Church or any Christian, as the *Roman* Catholicks do upon all Christians and all Churches whatsoever, for matters needful to be approved for eternal Salvation.

Our

APPENDIX.

Our AGREEMENTS.

IF the Roman Catholicks would make the Essence of their Church (as we do ours) to consist in these following points, we are at accord with them, in the reception and believing of:

1. All the Two and Twenty Canonical Books of the Old Testament and the Twenty Seven of the New, as the only Foundation and perfect Rule of our Faith.

2. All the Apostolical and Ancient Creeds, especially those which are commonly called the Apostles Creed, the *Nicene* Creed, and the Creed of St. *Athanasius*, all which are clearly deduced out of the Scriptures.

3. All the Decrees of Faith and Doctrine set forth as well in the first four general Councils, as in all other Councils, which those first four approved and confirmed, and in the 5th and 6th General Councils besides (than which we find no more to be General) and in all the following Councils that be thereunto agreeable; and in all the Anathemas or Condemnations given out by those Councils against Hereticks, for the defence of the Catholick Faith.

4. The unanimous and general Consent of the Ancient Catholick Fathers; and the Universal Church of Christ in the Interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, and the Collection of all necessary matters of Faith from them during the first Six Hundred Years and downwards to our own Days.

A P P E N D I X.

5. In acknowledgment of the Bishop of *Rome*, if he would rule and be ruled by the ancient Canons of the Church, to be the Patriarch of the *West*, by right of Ecclesiastical and Imperial Constitution, in such places where the Kings and Governors of those places had received him, and found it behooful for them to make use of his Jurisdiction, without any necessary dependence upon him by divine Right.

6. In the reception and use of the two blessed Sacraments by our Saviour, in the confirmation of those Persons that are to be strengthened in their Christian Faith, by Prayer and Imposition of Hands, according to the examples of the holy Apostles and ancient Bishops of the Catholick Church; in the publick and solemn Benediction of Persons, that are to be joined together in holy Matrimony; in publick or private absolution of penitent Sinners; in the consecrating of Bishops, and the ordaining of Priests and Deacons for the Service of God in his Church by a *lawful* Succession; and in visiting the Sick, by praying for them, and administering the blessed Sacrament to them, together with a final absolution of them from their repented Sins.

7. In commemorating at the Eucharist the Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood once truly offered for us.

8. In acknowledging his sacramental, spiritual, true, and real Presence there to the Souls of all them, that come faithfully and devoutly to receive him according to his own Institution in that holy Sacrament.

9. In giving thanks to God for them, that are departed out of this Life in the true Faith of Christ's Catholick Church, and in praying to God that they may have a joyful Resurrection and a perfect Consummation of Bliss, both in their Bodies

A P P E N D I X.

Bodies and Souls in his Eternal Kingdom of Glory.

10. In the Historical and Moderate Use of painted and true Stories, either for Memory or Ornament, where there is no danger to have them abused or worshipped with religious Honour.

11. In the Use of Indulgences, or abating the rigour of the Canons imposed upon Offenders according to their Repentance, and their want of ability to undergo them.

12. In the Administration of the Two Sacraments and other Rites of the Church with Ceremonies of Decency and Order, according to the Precept of the Apostle and the free Practice of the Ancient Christians.

13. In observing such Holy Days and Times of Fasting, as were in use in the first Ages of the Church, or afterwards received upon just Grounds by publick and lawful Authority.

14. Finally, in the reception of all Ecclesiastical Constitutions and Canons made for the ordering of our Church; or others, which are not repugnant either to the Word of God, or the Power of Kings, or the Laws established by *right* Authority in any Nation.

A
PUBLICK OFFICE
OF
DAILY and NIGHTLY
DEVOTION
For the SEVEN
CANONICAL HOURS
OF
PRAYER,
Used in the
ANGLOSAXON CHURCH.
With a TRANSLATION and NOTES.

By *WILLIAM ELSTOB.*

St. Luke, Chap. xviii. v. 7.
*And shall not God avenge his own Elect, which
cry Day and Night unto him?*

L O N D O N :
Printed by *W. B. for R. Sare,* 1715.



To the Reverend.

Dr. GEORGE HICKES.

REVEREND SIR,

UPON your communicating to me the Design of reprinting those Letters that passed betwixt you and a Popish Priest, and your desire that I would revise the Saxon Hours, published at the End of that Volume of Letters, I could not but readily comply; both upon the Account of the many Favours with which you have frequently obliged me, and likewise because I well remember that the Transcript of the Hours from which the first Edition was made, was far from being accurate. I have since had an Opportunity of correct-

A a 4

ing

P R E F A C E.

*ing all those Errors from the original MS. which is now in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, amongst the Books of Mr. F. Junius F. F. It is well known by the Name of the Codex Wigornienfis, having this mark, N. 121. Wulfgeat, who was the Writer of it, gives us this Account of himself; Hunc Librum scripsit Wulfgeatus scriptor Wigornienfis; Opa obsecro pio iprius neur cormicpatonem, Amen. Et qui me scripsit rempen sit felix, AMEN, fol. 101. Who it was that first translated these Offices for the Hours, into Saxon, I presume not to determine. The Style very much resembles that of Ælfric, it savours at least of that Age. And I guess the Version to have been made within that Space of Time, which fell between the beginning of King Eadgar's Reign, and the End of that of King Ethelred, and to have been Ælfric's Performance, if not rather that of Lupus, whom * Mr. Wanley ingeniously conjectures to have been the same with Wulfstan Archbishop of York, but formerly Bishop of Worcester, to which Church the Original MS. from which this Copy is taken did belong. What gives the greater Credit to this Conjecture is, that in the Book belonging to Bennet-College in Cambridge, written about the time of the Conquest, and noted S. 18, some Directions for the Hours, are to be seen amongst some Sermons, and other Tracts of Lupus: There is also a Poetical Paraphrase on the Lord's Prayer, and Doxology; but it wants those Lessons, and Hymns, and other things which make the Worcester Book a compleat Service. This to those who cannot per-*

* In his elaborate Catalogue of Saxon MSS. at the End of your *Thesaurus*, p. 140.

PREFACE.

use the Originals, will from Mr. Wanley's most learned and judicious Catalogue be very evident. V. p. 144. and 147.

In reviewing the last Edition, besides adjusting the Saxon Text according to the Original, I have made some Alterations in the Version itself, which I hope will be judged for the better. The Stile, as hath before been intimated, hath some Affinity with that of Ælfric; as his discovers some likeness of the Poetical Paraphrase upon Genesis, vulgarly ascribed to Cædmon: For as his Admonitions and Exhortations where he designs to be most pressing and earnest are in a musical Strain, so in the Offices for the Hours the same may be observed. A Specimen of this will appear in the greatest Part of this Tract, by distinguishing the Numbers in Verse, and I had gone through the whole, had not a long Indisposition made me unfit for much Attention, and that I fear'd your Bookseller would think it already run out to too great a Length. Nevertheless since the Design of publishing these Saxon Hours was to shew how pure their Devotion was from Error and Superstition in those Times, and since of those Hymns that were used in the Service, the first Line only is exhibited: to shew that they also contain nothing, but what is of equal Purity, I believed it might not be amiss to transcribe them from the Breviary, and let them appear in English. I hope the Poetry will be received with Candour from one, who hath never made that Art his Profession; if it hath Spirit enough to make the Devotion of the Hymns intelligible and useful, it is as much as was intended. The first in the Morning Office, was done

P R E F A C E.

done to my Hands by Bishop Cosins in his incomparable Manual of Devotions for the Hours.

Besides what is already mentioned, I have only given an Instance or two, to shew wherein the Saxon Hours agree with our Book of Common Prayer. If any of these Additions seem impertinent, or superfluous, they may be easily omitted; and so I desire they may, with all Deference to your Judgment, and Reverence for your Person, am,

REVEREND SIR,

Your most Obliged,

Humble Servant,

William Elstob.

APPENDIX.

De Officiis diurnalium nocturnarum horarum.

* *Of the Offices of the Daily and Nightly Hours of Prayer.*

GODEUND DE-
GODOM is re-
sette on cyphicum be-
nungum. æfter cano-
necican gesunan. to
nyopake eallum goha-
bedum mannum.

Divine Service is
appointed in the
Church Ministrations
according to Canonical
Custom, as a necessary
duty to all Men in Or-
ders.

On

Men

* They are also called *Hora Canonica*, Canonical Hours, being Times set apart for Divine Service by the Ecclesiastical Canons, to be observed by such Ecclesiastical Persons as were under this, or that Rule.

Concerning the number of these Hours of Devotion, the several Authors differ, who write about them. Some fix upon the number Eight, dividing the Night and the Day, each of them into four distinct Offices. Those of the Day, being thus distinguish'd, viz. the *First, Third, Sixth, and Ninth* Hours. The Night was divided into *Evening Service, Completorium, Nocturns, and Lauds*. This Number is defended by many. But the generality of the *Fathers*, rather chuse the Number *Seven* as it is prescribed in this Office, grounding also their choice upon the same words of holy *David*, Psalm. 119. 164. *Seven times a Day do I praise thee, because of thy righteous Judgments*. And the Authority of *David*, who being a King, and much of his time taken up in the Regal Administration, yet reserv'd so great a part of it for the Service of God, is not the only thing urged to give Countenance to this Number; but there are likewise
several

A P P E N D I X.

On ælcne tîmon. Man sceal gôð he- pian. And on ælcepe stope. Leofine to gôðe cly- pian.	Men ought at all Times, To worship God, And in every Place, Earnestly call on him.
Ac	Yet

several other Reasons alledg'd from Scripture, as that in the Prophet *Esaï*, Chap. 11. wherein are pointed out the seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost; 1. *The Spirit of Wisdom*, 2. *and Understanding*, 3. *The Spirit of Counsel*, 4. *and Ghostly Strength*, 5. *The Spirit of Knowledge*, 6. *and Piety*, 7. *The Spirit of a Holy and Godly Fear*. Again, Our Old Adversary takes unto him seven other Spirits wickeder than himself, Mat. 12. 45. and Luk. 11. 26. against whom we shall not be able to prevail without the sevenfold Grace of the Holy Spirit; therefore, in order to obtain this sevenfold Grace, the Church has appointed that Men should offer up a sevenfold Sacrifice of Praise to God. Furthermore, *Prov.* 24. 16. it is said, *A just Man falleth seven times, and riseth again*. There are likewise *seven deadly Sins*, and *seven Abominations*, *Prov.* 26. 25. Wherefore if any one would not fall into them, or having fallen into them would recover himself, he must praise God, and beg pardon seven times. Our Saviour has comprehended the Lord's Prayer in *seven Petitions*, and God Almighty finish'd the Works which he created in *seven Days*. These *seven Hours* are also said to be represented by the *seven Trumpets*, at the sound whereof the Walls of *Jericho* fell down, *Josh.* 6. and by the *seven Aspersions* or *Sprinklings*, *Levit.* 14. 51. To these we may add the *seven Stars*, *seven Churches*, and *seven Golden Candlesticks*, *Revel.* Ch. 1. And in this point we may receive farther information from several of the Fathers: As namely, *St. Basil*, *Greg. Nazianzen*, *St. Austin*, *St. Hierom*, &c. to which you will be refer'd by such as treat of the Churches Rituals. See *Durandus's Rationale*, *Durandus de Ritibus Eccl. Cathol.* Bishop *Cosin's Hours*, &c.

And if we would know the Consent of the Saxon Church in this particular, we shall find in the *Excerptions* of *Ecgbert Archbishop* of York, in the Year 750. mention made of the *seven Synaxes*, Canon. 28. which *seven Synaxes* were appointed to be sung and observed in this manner; the first was

A P P E N D I X.

Ac þeah hƿæðe.
 Synbon ȝeſette.
 Tīman ȝynþeplīce.
 To þam anum.
 Ðæt ȝyƿ hƿa.
 Fop byrgan.
 Ofƿon ne mæge.
 Ðæt he hupu ꝥ
 Nȳðriht ðæghƿam-
 lice.

Geſylle eal ȝƿa.
 Dauid cƿæð.
 Septies in die laudem
 dixi tibi. Ðæt iſ.
 Ʒeoƿon ȝiðon on ðæg.
 Ic ȝang ðe.
 Drihten to lofe.
 And to ƿeoðunge.
 To ȝelban hit bið.
 Beo hit aȝelðop.

On

Yet nevertheless,
 Certain appointed
 Times are ſet aƿat,
 For this one Cauſe,
 That if any one
 For his Buſineſs,
 Cannot oftner pray,
 He may that Duty
 Daily yet fulfil,

In ſuch manner as
David doth it ſay ;
Septies in die Laudes
dixi tibi † ; That is,
 Seven times a Day,
 Do I ſing,
 Lord to thy Praise,
 And to thy Worſhip,
 It too ſeldom is,
 If ſeldomer it be,

Than

was the *Synaxis Nocturnal*, ſung at Night ; the ſecond, the *firſt Hour* of the Day ; the third, that they call'd the *third Hour* ; the fourth, the *ſixth Hour* ; the fifth, the *ninth Hour* ; the ſixth, the *Veſpers* ; the ſeventh, *Completorium*: *Spelman's Conc.* Vol. I. p. 261. And again in *Ælfrick's Canons ad Wulſinum Episcopum*, Canon. 19. they are mentioned in this order ;

Uhtȝang. ȝ Ppimȝang. Unþennȝang. ȝ miððæg-
 ȝang. Nonȝang. ȝ Ʒenȝang. ȝ Nihtȝang ;
 where you ſee all agree as to the number, tho' they differ in
 the order. Our Offices ending with the Uhtȝang, whereas
 they begin with it. *Spel. Concil.* Vol. I. p. 577. See like-
 wiſe the 15th Canon of the Council of *Cloveſho*, under
Cuthbert Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, p. 249. In *Regula*
Monachica S. Benedicti, they are reckon'd up in this manner ;
 1. Uhtȝang. 2. Dægneðȝang. 3. Ppimȝang. 4. Un-
 þennȝang. 5. Miððægȝang. 6. Nonȝang. 7. Ʒenȝang.
 and more Inſtances might be added, but theſe may ſuffice.

† *Pſal.* 119. 164.

A P P E N D I X.

On dag we is god .	Than seven times a Day
Deþan. þonne þeo- pon iðum.	That we Praise God.
Dæc is æne æfter.	That is once first of all,
On ærne morgen.	At early : Morn ;
And eft on unbepn- tibe.	Then at : Undern- tide ;
And on midne dæg.	Next at : Mid-day ;
And on non.	Afterwards at Noon ;
And	At

1. On ærne Morgen, Early in the Morning, at Break of Day, or the first Hour. Our Six a Clock in the Morning. Being their first Hour in Old Times. From the Latin *Prima* it is called *Prime*, and the Service *Primsang*, as *Chancer* uses it, in the Tale of the Nonnes Priest.

Or it was *Prime*.

2. Unbepntibe. The third Hour of the Day. And þa he ut-cote æmbe unbepntibe. i. e. He went out about the third Hour, *Matth.* ch. 20. v. 3. in the Francic, Unborn þum quam than than oc an unborn tuo. It answers to our Forenoon or Nine of the Clock. The word you meet with in *Bede's Eccl. Hist. lib. 4. c. 22.* Fram unbepntibe þonne mon mæsse oftoft fingeð. From the third Hour when the Mass is usually sung. And the *Liber Medicus*, in the Royal Library at St. James's, mentions it among the three several times at which drink is permitted to be given ; that is, on Unborn. on Midæg. on Non. at Undern, at Mid-day, and at Noon. *Chancer* also uses it,

Till it was passed undern of the Day.

But *Versfegan*, through mistake, determines it to the Afternoon, or towards Evening. See more in *Somner's Dictionary*, and *Juon's* Glossary to the *Gothic Gospels*.

3. Midæg. Midday. Formerly the sixth Hour of the Day, and the Forenoon : But now is the same with our Noon, or Twelve a Clock.

4. Non. The ancient Noon, or *Horâ Nona*. Their ninth Hour, but our three a Clock in the Afternoon. Agreeable to which is their *Nonrang*, the same with our three a Clock Prayers.

A P P E N D I X.

Ans on tepen.	At 5 Even next ;
Ans on fopan-niht.	Then at the 6 Fore- part of the Night ;
Ans on uhtan ti- man.	And last at 7 Uhtan Time. It

5. *fEpen*. Even. The twelfth Hour according to the old computation, probably so called because it equally divided the four and twenty Hours, and made the parts of the Civil Day even.

6. *Fopan-niht*. The beginning or forepart of the Night. I suppose it might be our nine a Clock at Night. And that from thence we have a continu'd Custom of a nine a Clock Bell, &c.

7. *Uhtan*. or *Uhtan tið*. Our midnight or twelve a Clock at Night. Perhaps so called because that then the four and twenty Hours were run out, and the Civil Day was compleat ; in the Gothic *nhtvz* signifies the Morning, and *AM* in the Runic Lexicon is *vigilia matutina*, the Morning Watch, which will agree with the foregoing conjecture ; for as soon as the four and twenty Hours are out, and the Civil Day is finish'd, the Morning begins ; for Example, we say nine, ten, eleven, and twelve a Clock at Night but then begin again with one, two, three in the Morning. Unless it shall seem more reasonable to derive *nhtvz*, and *AM* or *Uhtan*, from *xiðan metuere, timere*, to fear, which makes *nhtreann*. *timebant*. they feared, *Marc. II. 32*. *Uht* being the dead time of the Night, which is usually very terrible, and full of Horror. Had the number of the Hours exceeded Seven, there had been room to conjecture that *Uht* might be the same as Eight ; *eahða s. iða Gr. Goth. Ahtan*, Runic *AM*, *atta vel aatta*, Teuton. *acht*, Germ. *acht*, Ital. *otto*, Hispan. *ocho*. This Conjecture might also be favour'd, by what is said in Cowell's Interpreter in the word *Uhtas*. "*Uhtas Octava* (says he) is the eighth day following any Term or Feast, as the *Uhtas* of St. Michael, the "*Uhtas* of St. John Baptist, as you may read 51 *Hen. 3*. "*concerning general Days in the Bench, and any Day between the Feast, and the Octava* is said to be within the "*Uhtas*, the use of this is in the return of Writs, as appears by that Statute. At the *Uhtas of the Holy Trinity* Preamble to the Statute 43. E. 3.

A P P E N D I X.

Nis æfre.
 Æniges mannes mæð.
 Ðæt he cunne.
 God swa forð gehe-
 man.

Sw a he wýrðe is.
 Ac hit is þeah
 Ure ealra þearf.

Ðæt we geornlice
 him.

Deorian. and ðenian.

Ðær ðe we magon 7
 cunnon.

It never is,
 Any Man's Privilege,
 That he should know
 So far to Worship
 God

As he deserves ;
 Yet it is nevertheless,
 The necessary Duty,
 Of us all,
 That him we ear-
 nestly
 Serve, and obey ;
 So as we may, and
 know.

DE*MATUTINALE OFFICIO.

† *Of the Morning Ser-
 vice.*

ON DÆGRED
 MAN SEAL GOD
 herian. eall swa Dawis
 cwæð. Deur ðeure meur
 as te be luce wigilo.
 Ðæt is. min drihten
 to þe ic wære of
 fsumleohze. 7 eft he
 cwæð. In matutinis
 so-

At Day-break Men
 ought to praise God, as
 David saith, † *Deus,
 Deus meus ad te de luce
 wigilo*, that is, *My Lord,
 I am awake to thee
 from the first Light.*
 And afterwards he says,
 †† *In matutinis Domine
 me-*

‡ Dægred. the Morning or break of Day, compounded
 of Dæg. Day, and red. as if you should say the red of the
 Day. After this manner we find the ancient Poets often
 describing the Morning. *Homer* calls her, *Ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως*,
the rose finger'd Morn ; others give her Horses of that colour ;
 and *Virgil* in his third *Aeneid* introduces her,

Jamq; rubescebat Stellis Aurorâ fugatis.

And now the rising Morn with rose Light,
 Adorns the Sky, and puts the Stars to flight. *Mr. Dryden.*
 And she is sometimes call'd *Crocea* and *Aurora*, as being of
 a Saffron and Golden Red.

* So the MS. † *Psal. 63. v. 1.* †† *Psal. 63. v. 7, 8.*

A P P E N D I X.

ðomine mebitaþon in
te. quia fuistī adiutor
meus. Ðæt is on ðæg-
nes ic smeabe ymbe þe.
forðamþe ðu wære
min fultum. Erist is
ealles mancýnnes ful-
tum. ⁊ ealles miððan
earðes helpend.

On ðægnes hit ge-
weard.

Ðat ðurh godes
michte.

Moses gelædde.

Ðat israhelitisce folc.

Of Egypta lanðe.

Eall unseme.

Ofer ða weaban sæ.

And æfter ðam sona.

Seo sylfe sæ.

Beferente ⁊ abferente.

Godes riðerinnan.

Pharaonem ⁊ eall his

* gengenre.

And on ðægnes.

Hit geweard.

Ðat Erist of ðeare
aras.

And

*meditabor in te, quia
fuisti adiutor meus.* That
is. At the dawning of
the Day I thought up-
on thee, for thou art
my Help. Christ is the
Helper of all Mankind,
and the Upholder of all
the Earth.

At day-break it was,

That through God's
Might.

Moses did lead.

The *Israelitish* Folk

From *Egypt's* Land,

Over the *Red Sea*,

All without harm :

And soon after that,

The self-same Sea

Sank, and did drink up

God's Enemies,

Pharaoh, and all his

Gang.

And at break of day,

It came to pass,

That † Christ from
death arose.

And

* *Legenge*, His Host, his Followers, of Company,
hence our modern English word *gang*.

† And Erist on þære
hpile.

To helle gengenre.

And þone ðeosol ge-
pyle.

And

And Christ that while

Went down to Hell,

And the Devil o'er-
came

B b

And

A P P E N D I X.

And of helle gelæbbe.
 Ealle ða ðe he wolde.
 And his riðen pinnan.
 Ðæt is beopol rýðne.
 He berencte.

And ealle his gegeng.
 On helle rýfle.

Ðý þe rýculon on bærg-
 neð.

God georne hepan.
 And him a þancian.
 Ðæne mildheortnýr-
 re.

Ðe he on mancýnne.
 Ða gepophhte.
 Ða þa he hit alýrde.

Of helle rýte.

And

And led out of Hell,
 All that he would,
 And his Adversaries,
 The Devil himself,
 He sank in sulphurous
 Hell,
 With all his Gang.

Wherefore we shall
 at break of day,
 Earnestly praise God,
 And him always thank
 For the mildhearted-
 ness,
 He on Mankind
 Did then bestow,
 When he released
 them

Out of Hell Punish-
 ment.

And

And him ofanam.

Adam 7 Euan.
 And heopa ofspring.
 Ðone sæl þe him.
 ðen gecwembe.
 And gelæbbe hi.
 To heopa lichaman.
 And anar of deaðe.
 Mið þam mucclum pe-
 nebe.

On þam ðriððan dæge.
 His þrowunge.

This will appear in the Sermon, *De Initio Creatura*, which
 is in *Ælfric's Collection*: All which will be accurately trans-
 lated and publish'd by Mrs. *Elix. Elstob*.

And took away from
 him,

Adam and Eve :
 And of their Offspring,
 All that part that him
 Before had pleased ;
 And them he led
 Unto their Bodies,
 And arose from Death,
 With the numerous

Host

On the third Day.
 Of his Suffering,

APPENDIX.

And of beoſles ge-
alce.

And geſymlce þanān
forð

Rihtne weg.

To heofona rice.

Ʒelcum þara Ʒe.

Ʒis pillan geſyncð.

Ʒen on life.

Amen.

De prima Hora

ON ƷERE FOR-
MAN bægtice.

Ʒæt is be Sunnon up-
gange.

Ʒer culon Ʒob heƿian.

And hine geornlice
biððan.

Ʒæt he Ʒuph his
miðheoptneſſe.

Ʒis Ʒoppe runnon
lihtinge.

Upe heoptan alihƷe.

Ʒæt is Ʒæt he Ʒuph
his gýſe.

Upe ingeþanc.

Ʒpa alihƷe.

Ʒæt is beoſol.

Of

And from the Devil's
Power.

And made room
thenceforth,

For a right way.

To Heaven's King-
dom.

For every one of those

That work his Will,

Here in this Life.

Amen.

* *Of the First Hour.*

At the first Hour of
Day,

That's, when the Sun
goes up,

We ought to Praise
God.

And earnestly him
pray,

That through his
Mercy,

He with the true
Sun's light,

Enlighten would our
Hearts.

That is, that thro' his
Grace,

Our inward Thoughts

He enlighten so,

That the Devil us,

B b z

From

* Concerning the first Hour, see more in the Notes upon the Offices in general, as also in the Canons of *Theodore*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, in the Year 668, which were afterwards translated into *Saxon* by *Ælfric*; amongst which Canons, the 16th bears the Title *Be Ʒumjangum*. The Original MS. is in *Bennet-College-Library at Cambridge*.

A P P E N D I X.

Of rihtan wege.
 Ðurh ðenienðe ðýr-
 tra.

Belæðan ne mæge.
 Ne mið rýngþunum.

To rryðe gehþem-
 man.

Deus in adiutorium
 meum intende. Domine
 ad adiuuandum me fe-
 rtina.

* Þer ðrihten Froð.
 Deopre fultum.
 Beheald ðrihten me.
 And me hpaðe.
 Ðýððan gefultuma.

Æt feophr þearfe.
 Gloria Patri.
 Ðý þe fulðop 7 lof.
 Þiðe geopenoð.

Leonoð ealle þeoda.

Ðanc 7 þýlla.

Mægen 7 milðre.

And ealler moðer lu-
 fu.

Soðfærtra rið.
 And þiner rýlþer
 ðom. Po-

From the right way,
 Through destructive
 Darknefs,

May not seduce,
 Nor with the Snares
 of Sin,

Gripe us too fast.

*Deus † in adiutorium
 meum intende, domine
 ad adjuvandum me fe-
 stina.*

Be O Lord, God,
 My noble Succour.
 O Lord help me,
 Oh be a ready Help
 To me in time to
 come.

At my Soul's Need.

Gloria Patri.

Be Glory and Praise
 Divulged far and
 wide.

Throughout all Na-
 tions,

Thanksgiving and
 good Will.

And Power and
 Mercy,

And all kind of Cha-
 rity

Among the Saints.

And thy own Judg-
 ment Appa-

* See the Morning Service in our Common-Prayer-Book,
*viz. O God, make speed to save us, O Lord, make haste to
 help us.*

† Psalm vii. 1.

A P P E N D I X.

Populbe geflregeob.

Ƣpa Ƣu pealban miht.

Call eopƢan mægen
Ƣ uplre.

Ƣinb Ƣ polcna.

ƢealberƢ call on
niht.

Patru Ƣ Ƣilio Ƣ Ƣpitu
rancto.

Ƣu eapƢ ƢroƢpa Ƣæ-
den.

And Ƣeoph hyƢbe.

Lifer lætteop.

LeohƢer pealbenb.

Arynbob Ƣnam rýn-
num.

Ƣpa Ƣin runu mæpe.

Ƣuph clæne gecýnb.

Lýnning oƢep ealle.

Bealb gebleƢob.

Boca laƢeop.

Ƣeah hiƢe ƢroƢpe.

And halig ƢarƢ.

Sicut erat in ppincipio.

Ƣpa Ƣær on Ƣpuman.

Ƣnea mænçynnep.

Ƣalpe populbe plite.

And ƢroƢpe clæne. Ƣ
cƢærƢig.

Ƣu gecýbberƢ Ƣ.

Ƣa

Apparent to the
World.

How thou canst com-
mand,

The strength of all
the Earth and Air,

The Wind and
Clouds.

Thou justly rulest
all.

*Patri, Filio, & Spiritui
sancto.*

Thou art Father of
Comforts,

Pastor of the Soul,

Life's Conductor,

And the Lord of Light;

Separate from Sin,

Even so thy Noble
Son,

By Nature pure,

King over all.

Blessed Prince.

Learning's chief Ma-
ster,

Sublime comfort of
the Soul.

And holy Spirit.

Sicut erat in principio.

As it was at first,

Lord of Mankind,

Beauty of all the
World,

And comfort pure,

And wise Providence.

Thou declaredst that

B b 3

When

A P P E N D I X.

Ða þu ece Gōð.

Ana gefophtest.
Ðu þu halge miht.

Heopnar ⁊ eopðan.

Eapðar ⁊ uplyft.

And ealle þing þu set-
test on folðan.

Ðyðe feala cýnna.

And togyfðobort
hið.

Ðyððon on mænego.

Ðu gefpohrest ece
Gōð.

On six ðagum.

Ealle gefceapta.

And on þone seof-
ðan.

Ðu gefsestest.

Ða þar gefopðað.

Ðin fægepe feopod.

And þu runnan ðæg.

Ðylf halgobest.

And gemænfobest
hine.

Manegum to helpe.

Ðone heahan ðæg.

Healðað ⁊ fpeoðað.

Ealle þa ðe cunnon,
Emstene þeapad.

Haligne heopt leopan.

When thou Eternal
God.

Alone didst create
Through thy holy
Might.

The Heavens and the
Earth ;

And with Earth the
Air.

And all things didst
dispose on Earth,

Of various kinds,
And dividedst them,

Into several sorts.

Thou madest, Eternal
God,

Within six Days space,

All created things,

And on the seventh
Day,

Thou didst take thy
rest,

For then finished

Were thy beauteous
Works ;

And thou the Sunday,

Thy self hallowedst,

And magnifiedst it,

For the ease of many,

That high Day

All keep and cele-
brate,

That know the Chri-
stian Rites.

Holy sincere Devotion,
And

A P P E N D I X.

Ans ðær hehrtan ge-
boð.

On ðrihtnes namon.
Se dæg is gefurðoð.
Et nunc ⁊ semper.
Ans nu ⁊ gymble.
Ðine soðan peopc.

Ans ðin mycele
miht.

Manegum pytelað.
Sra þine cpaftar heo.

Lýðap pibe.
Opep ealle populse.
Ece rtanbeþ.
Godeþ hand gepeopc.

Uropeð sra ðu hete.

Ealle þe hepað.
Ðalge ðreamar.
Elænne rterne.
Ans cristene bec.

Eall miððan eapð.
Ans þe men cpeðað.
On gunde hep.
Gobe lope ⁊ ðanc.

Ece pilla.
Ans ðin agen ðom.

Et in recula reculopum.
Ans on populða populð.

þunað ⁊ pixað.

Lyn-

And the most High's
Command,

In our Lord's Name,
The Day is honoured.
Et nunc ⁊ semper.
And now, and always.
Thy true, and real
Works,

And thy manifold
Power

To many doth appear,
As it thy wise Pro-
vidence,

Manifesteth wide
Over all the World.
Evermore doth stand
The Handywork of
God,

Increaseth as thou
promisedst,

All serve to thy praise.
• The Holy Harmony,
With Voices sweet,
And Book of Chri-
stian Truth.

All the Universe
And we Men declare,
Here upon the Earth,
Praise and Thanks to
God,

Thy Eternal Will,
And thy Judgment
great.

Et in secula seculorum.
And from World to
World

Endures and reigns,
B b 4 King

A P P E N D I X.

Lýnniꝅ innan pulſe.
 And his þa gecopenan.
 Deah Ðpýnnreſſe hal-
 ȝer ȝarter.
 Plitige englaſ.
 And pulſen ȝýſe.
 Soðe riſſe.

Sapla þanȝung.
 Moðermitre.
 Ðer iſ ȝeo mæſte
 luſu.
 Ðaliȝðomaſ heoſonaſ
 ȝýnðon.

Ðuþ þine ecan.

Æȝþær fulla.
 Ðpa ȝýnðon þine
 mihta.

Opeſ miððan ȝeaþð.
 Ðpuzele ȝ ȝeȝýne.
 Ðat þu hý ȝýlf poþhi-
 teſt. Amen.

Ȝe þæt ȝoþlice.
 Secȝað ealle.
 Ðuþ clæne ȝecýnð.
 Ðu eapſ cýning on-
 niht.

Clæne ȝ cþæſtig.
 Ðu ȝecýððeſt þ.
 Ða þu mihtaȝ ȝoð.

Man ȝeþoþhteſt.
 And him onþýðeſt.

Opuð ȝ ȝapul.
 Sealdreſt poþð ȝ ȝe-
 pte.

And

King in Glory,
 And his own Elect,
 The mysterious Tri-
 nity of the Holy Spirit,
 Angels beautiful,
 And Gift of Glory.
 Undissembled Friend-
 ship.

Soul's thankfulness,
 Compassion of Mind,
 There is most tran-
 ſcendent Love.

Heavens Sanctuaries
 are,

Thro' thy wiſe en-
 crease,

Every where full.
 And the great Effects
 Of thy mighty Power
 Over all the Earth
 Plain and evident,
 That thou thy ſelf haſt
 wrought. Amen.

We that faithfully,
 Do all declare,
 That by Nature pure
 Thou art rightly
 King.

Pure and Provident,
 Thou declaredſt that
 When thou mighty
 God,

Man didſt firſt create,
 And didſt breath into
 him

Spirit and Soul,
 Gav'eſt him Speech
 and Underſtanding,

A P P E N D I X.

And þeruma gecýnð.

And each kind of
Fruits.

Lybbert þine cnæp-
tar.

Thy Wisdom thou
didst then reveal,

Spýlc is Eyrter
miht.

Such is the power of
Christ.

HYMNUS.

HYMNUS.

Jam lucis orto ríbe-
ne Deum precemur
supplices. Deur

* Jam lucis orto fidere
Deum precemur suppli-
ces. The

* HYMNUS.

Jam lucis orto fidere,
Deum precemur supplices,
Ut in diurnis actibus,
Nos seruet a nocentibus.

HYMNUS.

Now that the Day-star doth
arise,
Beg us of God with humble
Cries,
Hurtful things to keep away,
While we duly spend the Day.
Our Tongues to guide so,
that no Strife,
May breed disquiet in our Life;
To shut and close the wandring
Eye,
Left it let in Vanity.
To keep the Heart as pure
and free
From fond and troubled Phan-
tasy,
To tame proud Flesh, while
we deny it,
A full Cup, and wanton Diet.
That when the Day-light
shall go out,
Time bringing on the Night a-
bout,
We by leaving worldly Ways,
May in silence sing God's Praise.
To God the Father Glory be,
And to his only Son,
And Holy Ghost Eternally,
Adored Three in One.

Linguam refrenans tempe-
ret,

Ne litis horror insonet:
Visum fovendo contegat,
Ne vanitates hauriat.

Sint pura cordis intima,
Assistat & recordia:
Carnis terat superbiam,
Potus cique paritas.

Ut cum dies abscesserit,
Noctemque sors reduxerit:
Mundi per abstinentiam,
Ipsi canamus gloriam.

Deo patri sit gloria,
Ejusque soli filio,
Cum spiritu paracleto;
Et nunc & in perpetuum.

Amen.

Amen.

See the Breviary in usum Sarum. Dom. primo in agendis
Mortuorum, fol. vi. a. Bishop Cosin's Hours in the Mattins,
or Office for Morning Prayer.

A P P E N D I X.

Deus in nomine tuo
saluum me fac ⁊ in vir-
tute tua libera me.

On þinum þam hal-
gan naman gebo me
hælc. God alyr me fram
laðum þurh þin leofe
mægen.

Regi autem seculo-
rum immortalī invisi-
bili soli deo honori ⁊
gloria in secula seculo-
rum. Amen.

Deo gratias.

Egryte Iesu fili. dei
unū cum sancto spīru-
tu mīserere nobis.

Qui sedes ad dextram
patris mīserere nobis.

Glo-

The Day-star being
risen, let us pray to
God humbly.

† *Deus in nomine tuo
saluum me fac ⁊ in vir-
tute tua libera me.*

In thy holy Name
make me safe, God de-
liver me from the wic-
ked, through thy migh-
ty Love.

*Regi autem seculorum
immortalī invisi-
bili soli Deo Honor ⁊ Gloria
in secula seculorum.
Amen.*

* To the King of all
the World, Immortal,
Invisible, to the only
God be Honour and
Glory, for ever and e-
ver. Amen.

Thanks be to God.

*Christe Jesu fili dei
vivi cum sancto spiritu
miserere nobis.*

Christ Jesu Son of
the living God, with
the Holy Ghost have
mercy on us.

*Qui sedes ad dextram
patris miserere nobis.*

Thou

† *Psalm. liv. 1.*

* *1 Tim. i. 17.* This concludes the *Mattins* in Bishop
Cosin's Hours.

A P P E N D I X.

Glōria Patri.

Criste Iesu. Exsurge
domine adiuvā nos ⁊ li-
bera nos propter no-
men tuum.

Aur spihthen nu.
Ans ur piceue.
Do pælnē fultum.
Ans ur æt feonðum.
Ahpæde forðon.
þe naman þinne.
Nýðe luptað.
Lýppie leison.

Criste leison.

Lýppie leison.

Pater noster qui es in
celis.

Fæðer mancýnner.
Froprer ic þe biððe.
Halig spihthen þu.
Ðe on heofonum

eart.

Sanctificetur nomen
tuum.

Ðæt ry gehalgod.

Þyge cræftum fært.

Ðin nama nu þa.

Thou who sittest at
the right hand of the Fa-
ther have mercy on us.

Glory be to the Father.

Criste Iesu. Exsurge
Domine adiuvā nos ⁊
libera nos propter nomen
tuum.

O Lord now arise,
And to us quickly
Send thy friendly Aid,
And rid us from our
Enemies, because
That we thy Name
With all Duty love.

Lord have Mercy
upon us,
Christ have Mercy
upon us.

Lord have Mercy
upon us.

Pater noster qui es in
Cælis.

Father of Mankind's
Comfort, I thee pray,
Holy Lord, ev'n thou
That in Heaven art.

Sanctificetur nomen
tuum.

That hallow'd may
be,

With our Soul's best
care,

Thy Name even now,

Ne-

O Re-

A P P E N D I X.

Nepiende Epir.
In upum * pephð lo-
can.

Færte gertaðelos.
Aueniat. regnum tu-
um.

Cume nu to mannum.
Mhta þealbend.
Ðin rice to us.
Rihtur bema. 7.
Ðin geleafa in.
Lif bæge on.
Upum mote mæne.
Ðurh sumge.

Fiat voluntas tua sicut
in celo 7 in terra.
And þin willa mid.
Us þeowðe ge lætend.
On eardunge.
Eorðan rice 7 swa.

Bluttop is.
In heofon pulpe.

Fynnum geþreowod.

A to woruld forð.
Panem nostrum cotidia-
num da nobis hodie.
Syle us nu to bæge.
Drihten gumena.
Deopena heah cýning.

Blas

O Redeemer Christ,
And within our
Breasts,

Be most deeply fixt.
Aueniat regnum tuum.

Come now unto Men,
Mighty Lord of Hosts,
Thy Kingdom to us.
Thou righteous Judge,
And thy true Belief,
In our day of Life,
Largely on our Minds,
Evermore abide,

*Fiat voluntas tua sicut in
Cælo & in Terra.*

And thy will with us,
Be here accomplished,
In the dwelling-place
Of thy earthly King-
dom,

With equal Purity,
As 'tis in Heaven's
Glory.

With Blessedness a-
dorn'd

To the World's end.

*Panem nostrum cotidia-
num da nobis hodie.*

Give us now to day,
Lord of all Mankind,
Heaven's King most

High, Our

* The same probably with pephð cora, which signifies the *Coffer, Chest, or Cabinet of the Soul or Spirit, the Breast, the Heart*; pephð cora, because it encloseth the Soul; pephð loca, because it locks it in, and keeps its Secrets.

A P P E N D I X.

Blas upne.

Done þu onſendeſt.

Saplum to hæle.

On miððan eapð.

Wanna cýnner.

Ðæt iſ je clæna.

Ʒurð drihten Ʒoð.

Et dimitte nobiſ debita
noſtra.

Forðgiſ uſ Ʒumena
pearð.

Ʒyltaſ Ʒ Ʒýnna.

Anð upe leahtpaſ.

Alet liceſ punða.

Anð onanðæða Ʒpa.

Ʒe miðsum Ʒiððe.

Ʒelmihtigum Ʒoðe.

Oft abylgæa.

Sicut Ʒ noſ dimittimur
debitoſiſuſ noſtriſ.

Ʒpa Ʒpa Ʒe Ʒoplaetað.

Leahtpaſ on eoſþan.

Ðam Ʒe Ʒið uſ oft.

AƷyltað anð him.

Ʒom bæðe Ʒitan.

Ne þenceð Ʒop eap-
nunge

Ecan liſeſ.

Et ne noſ inbucaſ in
temptationem.

Ne læb þu uſ to Ʒite.

In þean Ʒopge.

Ne in coſtunge.

Ʒurð neƷiƷenðe.

Ðy

Our daily Breed, which
thou

Sendeſt down to uſ,
For our Souls Health,
To Mankind on Earth.

That iſ the ſpotleſſ
Chriſt, the Lord our God.
*Et dimitte nobiſ debita
noſtra.*

Pardon, Man's Pro-
tectōr,

All our Guilt and Sin,
And our Faults forgive.
Our carnal Frailties,
Our Presumptions.
As oft as the Love,
The merciful Goodneſſ.
Of Almighty God.
We do provoke.

*Sicut Ʒ noſ dimittimur
debitoſiſuſ noſtriſ.*

Even as we forgive,
Their offence on Earth,
Who are frequently
Guilty towards uſ.
And for their evil deeds
Meditate no Wrath,
That we may obtain
Eternal Life.

*Et ne noſ inducaſ in
temptationem.*

And lead uſ not to
Puniſhment,
Not into ſad deſpair,
Nor Temptation,
Chriſt our Saviour,
Left

A P P E N D I X.

Dy lēƿ ƿe apleaƿe.
Ealra þinna milƿra.
Dyph ƿeond ƿcipe.
Frembe ƿeondan.

Lest we ungodly Men,
From all thy Mercies,
Thro' our Enmity
Strangers should be
made.

Ses libeƿa noƿ a malo.
And ƿið ƿƿele.
• Geƿƿeo uƿ.
Eac nuða. Feonba
gehpilceƿ.
ƿe inƿenþ locan.

Sed libera nos a malo.
From Evil set us free,

Even now from every
Foe,
We from the bottom
of our Hearts,
Ruler of Angels,
Lord truly vanquish-
ing.

Deoben engla.
Danc 7 ƿulƿon.
Soƿrige bƿihten.
Secgað geopne.

Give Thanks and
Glory.

Dæƿ ƿe þu uƿ milbe.
Mihtum alyƿeðt.
Fram hæƿtnýðe helle.
ƿiteƿ.

Forasmuch as thou
By thy gracious Power
From Hell's Captivity
Hast us redeemed.

Amen. ƿeopðe þæt.
Viuet anima mea 7 lau-
dabit te. 7 iudicia tua
adiuuabunt me.
Leofah ƿapul min.
And ƿe lufum he-
neð.

Amen. Be it so.
* *Vivet anima mea &
laudabit te, & iudicia
tua adiuuabunt me.*

Let my Soul live,
Thee fervently. I'll
praise.

And me þine domar.

And thy Judgments
shall

Dæbum fultumiað.
Errau sicut ovis que
perierat nequie
sepuum tuum domi-
ne. quia mandata tua
non sum oblitus.

All my deeds uphold.
† *Erravi sicut ovis que
perierat, require ser-
uum tuum domine,
quia mandata tua non
sum oblitus.*

It

I alas

A P P E N D I X.

Ic geþelebe swa.

Dat byrige sceap.

Dat ðe forþurðan
wolde.

Duru la' rec þinne
erne.

Elne, drihten.

Forðon ic þinra be-
boda.

Ne forgeat beoph-
tra ærfe.

CREDO IN DEUM

PATREM omnipo-
tentem,

ſelmihtig fæder.

Up on nobore.

Ðe þa ſcman gerce-
art.

Sceope 7 forhtet.

And eorþan pang.

Ealne getettert.

Ic þe ecne God.

ſenne gecenne.

Lustum gelyfe.

Ðu eart hƿes fnea.

Engla ondruma.

Eorðan pealben.

And þu garrecger.

Egumbar geforhtet.

And þa þu manego
cant,

Mænna tungla.

Et

I alas have stray'd,

As that foolish Sheep

That would be un-
done.

Seek then at least thine
own

Servant mighty Lord,

For as much as I

Thy Precepts pure,

Never will forget.

CREDO IN DEUM

PATREM *Omnipo-
tentem.*

Almighty Father,

In Heaven up on High.

That the Sky's pure
frame,

In thy Creation
wroughtst.

And the Earth's vast
plain.

All didst firmly set.

In thee Eternal God,

In Nature One,

I earnestly believe.

Thou art Lord of
Life,

Beginning of Angels,

Ruler of the Earth,

And of the Seas vast
Ocean,

Thou didst the bottom
lay.

And Stars many and
large,

Thou all dost know.

Et

A P P E N D I X.

Et in Iesum Christum
filium eius unicum
dominum nostrum.

Ic on sunu þinne.

Sopre gelyfe.

Ðælenðne cýning.

Ðæþen aþenðne.

Of þam uplican en-
gla rice.

Ðone Gabriel Godeþ
æpenðraca.

Sanctam Marian.

Sýlþne gebodode.

Iðeþ unmaene.

Heo þæt æpenðe.

Onfeng sþeolice.

And þe fæþer sýlþne.

Unþen þjeort cofan.

Beapn acenðe.

Nær þær gefrem-
með;

Fipen æt gýftum.

Ac þer halig gæst.

Ðanð-gýft fealde.

Ðær fennan borm.

Fýlðe mid blýsse.

And heo cuplice
cenðe.

Sþa meþne eopþ bu-
enðum engla fcyppenð.

Se to fþorþe ge-
peapþ.

Folð buenðum.

And ýmbe beþh-
leem. Bobe-

*Et in Iesum Christum
filium ejus unicum Do-
minum nostrum.*

And in thine only Son

Jesus our true King

I do believe.

Who was hither sent,
From the Angelick
Kingdom above.

Gabriel, God's Mes-
senger,

To holy *Mary* her self
Did this reveal.

The Virgin pure

The *Annunciation*

Gladly received,

And the Father himself.

She within her Womb

Conceiv'd a Son.

No carnal Marriage

Was consummate

there.

But the Holy Ghost,

Did impart his Power,

And the Virgin's bosom

With Joy fulfill'd.

So that she surely did
bring forth

To those that dwell on
Earth.

The great Creator of
Angels;

Who was to be a fu-
ture Comfort

To the Inhabitants of
of the Earth.

And near *Bethleem*.

An-

A P P E N D I X.

Bodeðan englar.
 Ðat acenned þær.
 Crist on eorðan.
 Passur sub Pontio Pi-
 lato.

Ða se Pontius Pila-
 tur.

Feolð under pompa-
 pum.

Rices 7 boma.

Ða se ðeopa fpea
 ðeað þrowabe.

On gealgan stah.

Eumena drihten.

Ðone geomoþu moð.

Lorep býrigðe.

And he of helle.

Ðuðe gefette.

Of þam surþ hope.

Sapla manega.

Ðet ða uplicne eþel
 recan.

Tertia die resurrexit
 a mortuis.

Ðær þý ðrubbæn bæge.

Ðeoba pealbent.

Apar ricef fpea.

Recen of molban.

And he peoþenrig ðaga.

Folgenar sine.

Ru-

Angels proclaimed
 That Christ on Earth
 was born.

*Passus sub Pontio Pi-
 lato.*

When *Pontius Pilate*

Under the Roman
 Powers,

Rul'd as King and
 Judge.

Then our dearest Lord
 Suffer'd Death,

Upon the Cross,

The Lord of Men,

Whom with mournful
 thought

Joseph buried ;

And he out of Hell's

Captivity brought,

From the Brimstone
 Cave.

Many Souls.

Then commanded
 them to seek

Their heavenly Coun-
 try.

*Tertia die resurrexit a
 mortuis.*

On the third day after,

The Ruler of Nations,

And Lord of the King-

dom arose,

Forthwith from the
 dust ;

And he forty Days

To his Disciples,

C. c

Un-

A P P E N D I X.

Runum appetite.	Unfolded Mysteries :
And ða his rice began.	And then his Reign began.
Done uplican eðel recan.	To seek his heavenly Country,
Epæð þæt he nolde.	He then his Proclamation made,
Nænne forlætan.	That he would none refuse,
De him forð openð.	Who for the time to come
Filian polde.	Would follow him,
And mið færtum je- fan.	And with a constant Mind
Fæbbe gelestan.	His Salvation com- pleat.
Crebo in spiritum sanctum	<i>Credo in spiritum san- ctum.</i>
Ic haligne gart. ðilte beluce.	I the Holy Ghost With my sure trust embrace.
Emne swa ecne swa is.	Who by the Languages of the Nations,
Aðon gecpeben.	Is made manifest,
Fæder oððe fneo beapn.	To be equally Eter- nal
Folca geneopðum.	With the Father,
Ne synð þ þneo Lo- gar.	And his only Son :
Ðwya genemnes.	These are not three Gods,
Ac is an Grob.	Under * three several Names.
Seðe ealle hapað, ða þny naman.	But it is one God, All the three Names hath. A my-

* *Epiphanius* several times calls the Holy Ghost *tertius in
personis*, the *third in Name*, as the incomparable Bishop
Pearson observes.

A P P E N D I X.

Ðmga genýnum joð
7 rígefært.

Ofen ríbe gerceaft.
Feneba pulþongýra.

Flanc 7ece.

Sanctam Ecclesiam Ca-
tholicam.

Eac ic gelyfe.
Ðæt rýnleoƿe Gode.

De þurh ænne ge-
þanc.

Ealþon hepað.
Deoƿona heah cýnung.

• Ðer ƿon life.

Sanctorum Communio-
nem.

And ic gemænrcipe.
Mæpne getreowe.

Ðinra haligra.

Ðer ƿon life.

Remissionem Peccato-
rum.

Lisse ic gelyfe.

Leahtra gehpylces.

Carnis Resurrectionem.

And ic þone ænigc
ealra getreowe.

Flærceƿ on ƿoltan.

On

A mysterious thing,
True, and most con-
vincing.

O'er the Creation wide
He is the Lord of Hosts,
And Giver of Glory.

Magnificent and Eter-
nal

*Sanctam Ecclesiam Ca-
tholicam.*

I likewise believe,
That * Spouse beloved
of God.

The holy Church,
That with one Mind,
Doth Praise the Lord,
Heaven's exalted King,
Here in this Life.

*Sanctorum Communio-
nem.*

I also believe
The great Communion
Of all thy Saints
Here in this Life.

Remissionem Peccatorum.

And I do believe
The Remission
Of each Offence.

Carnis Resurrectionem.

And I do believe
The Resurrection
Of all Flesh on Earth

C. c. 2.

At

* *Syn Conjux, sponsa, a Wife, a Spouse, Ephes. v. 22, 23, 31, 32, and Rev. xix. 7, 9.*

A P P E N D I X.

On þa poþhtantib.
 Et uitam Eternam.
 Dæp þu ece lif.
 Eallum bælbært.
 Sþa hep manna geh-
 pylc.

Metode gecpemað.
 Et ego ab te domine cla-
 mau i mane oratio
 mea ppreueniet te.
 Ic me to ðe.
 Ece drihten.
 Mið mobgehygbe.

Mægne clýpode.
 And min gebet.
 Monæna gehpýlc.
 Fone rýlfne ðe.
 Soðpært becume.

Uerba mea auribus per-
 cipe domine intellege
 clamorem meum.
 Forþ þu min onfoh.

Fulþer ealþon.
 And mið earum ge-
 hýp.

Ece drihten.
 Intende uoci orationis
 meæ. rex meus. i
 Deus meus.
 On gýt mæn clý-
 punga.

Euðum geþeopbe.
 Behealb min gebet.

þol-

At the Day of Dread.
Et uitam Eternam.
 When Eternal Life
 Thou dost give to all,
 As each Man shall here

His Creator please.
 * *Et ego ad te domine
 clamavi & mane Ora-
 tio mea preueniet te.*
 I my self to thee,
 Eternal Lord,
 With full trust of
 Mind,
 Have loudly call'd,
 And my faithful Prayer

Every Morning shall
 Before thee come.
 † *Verba mea auribus
 percipe domine, intel-
 lige clamorem meum.*
 Receive thou my
 words,

O King of Glory,
 And hear them with
 thy Ears,
 Eternal Lord.

*Intende uoci orationis
 meæ, rex meus, &
 Deus meus.*

Hearken to my cry

In words well known :
 Behold my Supplica-
 tion. From

A P P E N D I X.

Dolbum mōbe.
 Ðu eart min cýning.
 And eac ece God.

Quoniam ab te orabo
 domine mane exau-
 dies uocem meam.

Forðon ic to ðe.

Ece ðuhten.

Soðum gebette.

And ðu sýmble gehýr.

Morgena gehpylce.

Mine stefne.

Quoniam non Deus uo-
 lens iniquitatem tu
 es. Mane adstabo ti-
 bi ⁊ uidebo.

IC þe ætŕtanbe.

Œr on morgen.

And ðe sýlfne gereo.

Forðon ic to soþe
 pať.

Ðat þu unriht ne pilť.

Œnig ðrihten.

Edoce me, uiaŕ tuar do-
 mine notaŕ fac mihi.
 ⁊ semitaŕ.

Dome pegar þine.

Œiŕe ðrihten.

And me ðinpa sťiŕa.

Œtaþa eac gelæp.

Di-

From a faithful Mind,
 For thou art my King,
 And Eternal God.

* *Quoniam ad te orabo
 domine mane exaudies
 uocem meam.*

Because that I to thee,
 Eternal Lord,
 Faithfully pray ;

Do thou always hear
 My Voice every Morn.

† *Quoniam non Deus
 uolens iniquitatem tu
 es. Mane adstabo ti-
 bi ⁊ uidebo.*

I will stand before
 thee,

Early in the Morning,
 And will look up to
 thee,

For as much as I
 Certainly know
 That thou O Lord,
 Wilt no unrighteous-
 nefs.

‡ *Edoce me uias tuas,
 domine, notas fac mihi,
 ⁊ semitas tuas.*

The ways of thy
 Judgments.

And footsteps of thy
 Paths.

Teach me O wise Lord.

C c 3

* Di-

* *Psal. v. 3.*

† *Ÿ. 4.*

‡ *PŒ. xxv. 3.*

A P P E N D I X.

Dirige me in ueritate
tua ⁊ doce me quia
tu es Deus salutaris
meus. ⁊ te sustinui
tota die.

Gepece me on pæbe.

And me pucene gelær.
Ðat ic on þinne soð-
fæstnýrre.

Sýmble lýrge.

Reminiscere miserationum
tuarum domine.
⁊ misericordiae tuae
quae a seculo sunt.

ƿer þu gemýnbig.

Miltŕa þinna.

Ðe þu bŕihten bý-
deŕt.

Sýððan ða ġar pæron.

And þu ƿiŕlice.

Ðar ƿopulð ġeŕet-
teŕt.

Delicta iuuentutis meae
⁊ ignorantiae meae
ne memineris domine.
secundum magnam mise-
ricordiam tuam
memor esto mei Deus.

Ne geminea þu me.

Minna fýpena.

Epampa

* *Dirige me in ueritate
tua ⁊ doce me quia
tu es Deus salutaris
meus, ⁊ te sustinui
tota die.*

Direct me with thy
Counsel,

And teach me speedily,
That I may in thy
Truth

For ever live.

† *Reminiscere miserationum
tuarum domine ⁊
misericordiae tuae quae
a seculo sunt.*

O be thou mindful
Of all thy Mercies,
Which thou O Lord
hast done

Since the days have
been.

And thou wisely hast,
The World established.

‡ *Delicta iuventutis meae
⁊ ignorantias meas ne
memineris domine, se-
cundum magnam mise-
ricordiam tuam memor
esto mei Deus.*

O be not thou too
mindful

Of my impetuous
Lusts.

Which

A P P E N D I X.

ƒrampa togeorne.
þe ic geong ðýðe.
And me uncuðe. æg-
hpær. pæron.

Fop ðinne þære mý-
clan.

Milð heortnýrre.
ƒeonð gemýnbis.
Mihtrig ðrihten.

Iubica Domine nocen-
ter me. expugna im-
pugnantes me.
Dem ðrihten nu.
Ða me ðerebon æp.

Apeohr pýlce.

Ða me fuhtan to.

Aðppehenbe apma 7
ŕcutum 7 exsurge in
adiutorium mihi.
Legpup ƒap 7 ŕcýlð.

And me georne ƒer-
tanð.

On fultume.

ƒið ŕeonða ƒnýne.

Effunde ŕameam, 7
conclude aduerŕur
eor, qui me perŕe-
cuntur. dic anime
meæ ŕaluŕ tua ego
ŕum.

healð me hepe pæp-
num.

Which I was guilty of
when young,
And did in ignorance.

In the multitude

Of thy Mercies,
Think upon me
Mighty Lord,

* *Judica Domine nocen-
tes me, expugna im-
pugnantes me.*

Judge now O' Lord
Them that me have
hurt.

And fight against eve-
ry one

That have against me
fought.

† *Adprehende arma &
ŕcutum & adŕurge in
adiutorium mihi.*

Lay hold of thy Arms
and Shield,

And ŕand firmly to my
Aid

Against the Terror of
my Foes.

‡ *Effunde frameam &
conclude aduerŕus eos
qui me perŕecuntur,
dic animæ meæ ŕaluŕ
tua ego ŕum.*

Defend me with thy
Weapons. Cc 4 A-

* *Pŕal. xxxv. 1.*

† *ŕ. 2.*

‡ *ŕ. 3.*

A P P E N D I X.

ƿið unholbum.
And ƿið beluc.

ƿraðum ƿeonbum,
De min ehtenð.
Ealle rýnbon.
Sæge þonne rýððan.
Saple minne.
Ðet þu hiðe on hæle.
Dolb gertode.

Repleatur of meum
laude tua ut possim
cantare gloriam tu-
am tota die magni-
ficentiam tuam.
Ðý min muð.
And min mod.
Mægne gefýlles.

Ðat ic þin lof mæge.
Lursum ringan.
And ƿulðon þin.
ƿibemærjan.
And ðe ealne ðæg.
Seðhep heþian.
Auerſte faciem tuam a
peccatis meis. ⁊ om-
nes iniquitates meas
dele.
Apenð þine anýne.
A fram minum.
Fracnum fýpenum.
And nu ƿopð heo-
non.

Call

Against the unfaithful,
And protect me in the
Battle,
Against my furious
Enemies,
That are all persecu-
ting me.
Say then hencefor-
ward to my Soul,
Thou to her safety
kindly stood,

* *Repleatur os meum
laude tua ut possim
cantare gloriam tuam
toto die magnificentiam
tuam.*

Let my Mouth and
Mind
With thy Power be
fill'd.

That I may thy praise
Sing with delight.
And thy Glory
Magnify abroad.
And thee all the day
Each where celebrate.

† *Auerte faciem tuam a
peccatis meis, ⁊ om-
nes iniquitates meas
dele.*

Turn away thy face
From my destructive
Sins.
And now from hence-
forth

All

* *Psal. lxxi. 7.*

† *Psal. li. 9.*

A P P E N D I X.

Call min unriht.

All mine unrighteous-
ness

Aðpærc æghþer gymle.
Eop mundum cpea in
me Deus. ⁊ Spiritum
pectum innoua in uis-
ceribus meis.

Every where blot out.
* *Cor mundum crea in
me Deus, ⁊ Spiritum
rectum innova in vis-
ceribus meis.*

Syle me halig God.

Give me holy God

Deoptan clæne.

A clean Heart

And rihtne gart.

And a right Spirit,

God genipa on.

In my Soul, O God,

Minne gehigðe.

Renew at least, my

Dupu min drihten.

Lord.

Ne pponciar me a facie
tua. ⁊ Spiritum san-
ctum tuum ne aufer-
as à me.

† *Ne projicias me à facie
tua ⁊ Spiritum san-
ctum tuum ne auferas
à me.*

Ne arip þu me.

Cast me not away,

Ƴulþer ealþor.

O Lord of Glory,

Fram þinne anryne.

From before thy face.

ƳeƳe to Ƴeope.

Ever too far,

Ne hupu on Ƴeg abep.

At least bear not away

Done halgan gart.

Thy Holy Spirit,

Ðat he me Ƴæringa.

That he forthwith be-

come

Fremðe Ƴynðe.

A Stranger to me.

Redde michi letitiam
salutaris tui ⁊ Spi-
ritu Principali con-
firma me.

† *Redde michi letitiam
salutaris tui ⁊ Spi-
ritu principali confirma
me.*

Syle me þinne hælu.

Give me thy Salvation

Ðolbe bliƳe.

With sure Happiness,

And me ealþoplice.

And with thy princi-

ƳeƳe garte.

pal, noble Spirit

On ðinne pillan ge-

Render me perfect

tryme. Ƴe-

In all thy Will, O

* *Psal. li. 11.*

† *Ƴ. 12.*

‡ *Ƴ. 13.*

A P P E N D I X.

ƷeƷoða ðrihten.

Eripe me domine ab
homine malo a viro
iniquo libera me.
Genepe me Ʒið nipe.

On naman Ʒinum.
ƷƷam ƷƷelum men.
Ece ðrihten.

Eripe me ðe inimiciꝝ
meiꝝ. Deus meus ꝥ ab
insurgentibus in me
libera me.

Ahpebe me halg Godes.
DeƷigeꝝ nipeꝝ.
Feonða minna.

Ðe me Ʒeohtap to.

Alȝ me ƷƷam la-
pum.

Ðe me luge.

OnƷiꝝan Ʒillaþ nȝmpe.
Ðu me Ʒæb ȝipe.

Eripe me ðe operanti-
bus iniquitatem. ꝥ
ðe viro sanguinum
salua me.

Genepe me ƷƷam
nipe.

Naht ƷƷemmenða.

Ðe heƷ unƷihter
ealle ƷȝƷceaþ.

And me Ʒiþ.

BloðhpeoƷer ƷeƷer.

Bea-

O Lord of Hosts.

* *Eripe me domine ab
homine malo a viro
iniquo libera me.*

Deliver me from the
Envy

Of evil Men
For thy Name's sake,
Eternal Lord.

† *Eripe me de inimicis
meis deus meus ꝥ ab
insurgentibus in me
libera me.*

Rid me, O holy God,
From the heavy Malice
Of my Foes

That against me fight.
Release me from the
wicked,

That would rise up
Against me with Lyes,
Unless thou Counsel
give.

‡ *Eripe me de operanti-
bus iniquitatem, ꝥ de
viro sanguinum salva
me.*

Deliver me from the
Malice.

Of those that do no
good,

That here work all
unrighteousness;

And from blood-guil-
ty Men's

Con-

* *Psal. lx. i.*

† *Psal. lviii. i.*

‡ *Id. 2.*

A P P E N D I X.

Bealupe gehæle.

Ʒic Ʒſalmum Ʒicam no-
mini tuo Deus in re-
culum ſeculi. ut red-
dam uota mea de die
in diem.

Ʒpa ic naman Ʒinum.

* Neode ſinge.

Ʒat min gehat heƷ
aƷylde.

Of bæge on bæge.

Ʒpa hiƷ geƷere Ʒere.

Exaudi noſ Deus ſalu-
tariſ noſter ſper
omnium Ʒinium Ter-
re 7 in Mari longe.

GehƷp uſ hælenð

Grod.

Ʒu eapt hiht ealpa.

Ʒe on Ʒiſſe eopðan.

Utan ſynðon.

Oððe Ʒeop on Ʒæ
Ʒoldum Ʒuniað.

Benedic anima mea do-
mino. 7 omnia in-
teruopra mea nomen
ſanctum eiur.

BleƷra mine ſaple.

Bliðe ƷƷihten.

Anð eall min inneƷan.

Ʒiſ Ʒone ecan naman.

Be-

Confuſion ſawe.

† Sic Ʒſalmum dicam
nomini tuo Deus in
ſeculum ſeculi, ut red-
dam uota mea de die
in diem.

So I unto thy Name

Will dutifully ſing,

That I may pay my
Vows,

From day to day,

As it behoveth me.

‡ Exaudi noſ, Deus ſa-
lutaris noſter ſpes om-
nium finium Terræ
Ʒ in Mari longe.

Hear uſ God, our Sa-
viour,

Thou that art the Hope

Of all that be

Upon the ſurface of
the Earth,

And that remain

Far in the bottom of
the Sea.

‡‡ Benedic anima mea
Domino Ʒ omnia in-
teriora mea nomen ſan-
ctum eiur.

Bleſs, O my Soul,

Chearfully the Lord,

And all that is in me

His Eternal Name.

* Be-

* Neode is perhaps a miſtake of the Scribe, for Leode,
a Song, or Ʒſalm.

† Ʒſal. lxi. 8.

‡ Ʒſal. lxxv. 5.

‡‡ Ʒſal. ciii. 1.

A P P E N D I X.

Benedic anima mea do-
mino. ⁊ noli obliui-
ci omnes peributi-
ones eius.

Bletsige mine syle.

Bealbe drihten.

Ne wilt þu oþer
geotul.

ƿeƿe ƿeoþðan.

Ealra goða,

De he ðe ær byðe.

Qui propitiatur omni-
bus iniquitatibus tu-
is. qui sanat omnes
languaſes tuos.

De þinum mandæ-
bum.

Miltſæde eallum.

Ans ðine able.

Ealle gehæls.

Qui redemit de interi-
tu uitam tuam. qui
sanat in bonis deſi-
derium tuum.

Se alyrðe þin lif.

Leof of forþþrðe.

Fylðe þinne willan.

Fægepe mið goðe.

Qui coronat te in mi-
ſeratione ⁊ miſere-
cordia. renouabitur
ſicut aquile iuuentus
tua,

De þe geſygeſæte.

Soðpe

* *Benedic anima mea
Domino ⁊ noli obli-
viſci omnes retributio-
nes ejus.*

Bleſs, O my Soul,
Faithfully the Lord :
Nor be thou ever for-
getful

Of all the good things

He of old did for thee.

† *Qui propitiatur omni-
bus iniquitatibus tuis,
qui sanat omnes lan-
guores tuos.*

To all thy wicked
deeds

He mercy ſhew'd ;
And all thy weakneſſes
Hath alſo heal'd.

‡ *Qui redemit de interi-
tu uitam tuam, qui
sanat in bonis deſide-
rium tuum.*

Who thy life hath ſav'd
Kindly from deſtru-
ction,

And fulfill'd thy Will
In ſeaſon with all good.

‡‡ *Qui coronat te in mi-
ſeratione ⁊ miſerecor-
dia, renouabitur ſicut
aquile juventus tua.*

He crowneth thee
With

* *Pſal. ciii. 2.*

† *ſ. 3.*

‡ *ſ. 4.*

‡‡ *ſ. 6.*

A P P E N D I X.

Soðre mildre.
And ðe mildheorte.

Mobe getrymebe.
Eart þu eðnipe.
Eapne gelicort.
On geoguðe nu.
Gleap geporþen.

Confiteor domino deo
Cæli.

Conuerpte nos Deus sa-
lutarij noster. ⁊
auerte iram tuam a
nobis.

Gehpeorþ ur hpaðe.
Dælenð ðrihten.
⁊ ðin yppe fram ur.
Eac oncýppe.

Dignare Domine die
isto. sine peccata
nos custodire.

Milðra ur nuþa.
Mihtrið ðrihten.
Milðra ur.

Fiat misericordia tua
domine super nos
quemadmodum spe-
rauimus in te.

⁊ ȳfe þin mildheort-
nið.

Mihtrið ðrihten.

⁊ ell oþer ur.

Spa pe penaþ on þe.

Do-

With true Compassion,
And with Loving-
kindness

Doth thee adorn.
Thou shalt be restored
Just as is an Eagle,
Now in Youth.
And shalt wife become.

*Confiteor Domino Deo
Cæli.*

I make my Confession
to the Lord of Heaven.

* *Conuerpte nos Deus sa-
lutaris noster, ⁊ auer-
te iram tuam a nobis.*

Turn us speedily,
O Lord, our Saviour,
And thy Indignation
Turn away from us.

*Dignare Domine die
isto, sine peccato nos
custodire.*

Have Mercy now on us,
Mighty Lord,
Have Mercy on us.

† *Fiat misericordia tua
Domine super nos
quemadmodum spera-
uimus in te.*

Be thy loving-kind-
ness,

Mighty Lord,

Well over us,

As we trust in thee.

* Do-

A P P E N D I X.

Domine. saluum fac pe-
gem. ⁊ exaudi nos in
die qua inuocaueri-
mur te.

Do drihten Eob.
Lýng ðædum halne†.

And ur eac gehýp.
Dolbum mote.
Spilce pe ðe ðaga.
Drihten cigen.

Saluum fac populum
tuum Domine. ⁊
benedic hereditati
tue. ⁊ rege eor ⁊
extolle illoꝝ urque in
æternum.

Ðal so þin folc.
Ðalig drihten.
And ðin ýpfe eac.

Eal geb'etra.
Rece þu heo spýlce.
And on riht ahepe.

Ðæt hi on popule.
Sýnnum lýfgen.

Fiat Pax in uirtute
tua ⁊ abundantia in
turrubus tuis.

Sýþe on ðinum mæg-
ne sib.

Mægt

* Domine. saluum fac
regem ⁊ exaudi nos
in die qua invocave-
rimus te.

O Lord God preserve
The King in all his
Deeds.

And hear us likewise,
From a faithful Mind,
Each Day that we dare
Call thee our Lord..

† Saluum fac populum
tuum Domine, ⁊ be-
nedic hereditati tue,
⁊ rege illos ⁊ extolle
illos usque in æter-
num.

Save thine own People,
Holy Lord,
And all thine Inheri-
tance,

Bless thou likewise.
Govern all of them,
And lift them up in
righteousness;

That they in the World
May peaceably live.

‡ Fiat Pax in uirtute
tua ⁊ abundantia in
turribus tuis.

Be Peace thro' thy
Might,

Most

† The Saxon Loyalty here is perspicuous, they thought that as often as they pray'd to God their Lord, they ought to pray for him who was Representative of God their Lord.

* Psal. xx. 9.

† Psal. xxviii. 10.

‡ Psal. cxii. 7.

A P P E N D I X.

Wæst 7 fýrmeſt.
 And on þinum toþ-
 rum.

Feſe tidum genih-
 ʒum.

Domine exauði opati-
 onem meam 7 cla-
 mor meur ad te per-
 ueniat.

Du min geheð.
 Wære drihten.
 Lehyr heofonar pe-
 aþ.

And gehlyde min.
 To ðe becume.
 Deoða peccenð.

Miſerepe mei Deus re-
 cundum magnam mi-
 ſerecordiam tuam.

Milðe me.
 Witað drihten.
 Ða þu manegum
 dyðeſt.

Feſter þinne þære
 mycelan milðneop-
 nýſſe.

Domine Deus uirtu-
 tum conuerſe noſ 7
 oſtenðe faciem tuam
 7 ſalui erimur.

Lehpeoþf ur mægna
 God.

And ur milðe æteop.
 Ðinne anþlitan.

Ealle

Moſt and fiſt of all,
 And within thy Tow-
 ers

Be plenteous times.

* *Domine exaudi Ora-
 tionem meam & cla-
 mor meus ad te per-
 ueniat.*

My Prayer, mighty
 Lord,
 Towards Heaven hear,

And let my cry to
 thee,
 Ruler of Nations,
 come.

† *Miserere mei Deus
 ſecundum magnam mi-
 ſerecordiam tuam.*

Have Mercy on me,
 mighty Lord,
 As thou to many haſt
 done.

After thy manifold
 loving-kindneſs.

‡ *Domine Deus virtutum
 conuerſe nos, & oſten-
 de faciem tuam &
 ſalvi erimus.*

Turn thou us Lord of
 Hoſts,

And favourably ſhew
 To us thy countenance,

And

* *Pſal. cii. 1.*

† *Pſal. li. 1.*

‡ *Pſal. lxxx. 19.*

A P P E N D I X.

Ealle þe beoð hale.

And we shall all be whole.

Domine sancte Pater omnipotens æterne Deus. qui nos ab principio huius diei peruenire fecisti. tua nos salua uirtute. ut in hac die ad nullum declinemus peccatum. res semper ad tuam iustitiam faciebamus. nostre procebat eloquia. ⁊ dirigantur opera. per &c.

* O Lord, holy Father, Almighty and Everlasting God, who hast brought us to the beginning of this Day, keep us by thy Power, that this Day we may fall into no Sin, but that all our Words and Works may be utter'd, and directed to fulfil thy Righteousness, through, &c.

Pretiosa est in conspectu domini. mors sanctorum eius.

† *Right dear in the sight of the Lord is the death of his Saints.*

Sancta dei genetrux uirgo Maria ⁊ omnes sancti dei intercebant pro nobis peccatoribus. ad dominum dominorum ut mepeamus ab eo adiuuari ⁊ salua-

† Let the holy Mother of God, the Virgin Mary, and all the Saints of God intercede for us Sinners, with the Lord of Lords, that we may be worthy to be assisted and

* Compare this with the third Collect for Grace, in the Office for Morning Prayer, in, *Our English Liturgy*, or *Common-Prayer-Book*.

† *Psal. cxvi. 13.*

† In another ancient MS. said to be written in *Latin* by *Theodore*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and translated into *Saxon* by *Ælfrick*, after the Names of those Saints were repeated, whose Feasts were to follow the next Morning, and the Verse *Right dear*, &c. the Prior was to pray in this manner, *Ipsi & omnes sancti intercedant pro nobis peccatoribus, ad Dominum, ut mereamur possidere uitam æternam. Amen.* May these and all the Saints intercede with our Lord for us Sinners, that we may be worthy to obtain Eternal Life. *Amen.*

A P P E N D I X.

ſaluari qui uiuſ ꝛ pꝛe-
ſer deus. pꝛeſer.

Deus in adiutorium
meum intende domine
ad adiuuandum me fe-
ſtina.

ſer drihten Godes.

Deus pultum.

Beheals me drihten.

Ans me hpaðe rýð-
ðan gefultuma.

ſet feorh þearfe.

Gloria Patri.

Kýrrne eleiſon.

Pater noſter.

Eſt ne noſ inuocar.

Reſpice in ſeruos tuos
ꝛ in opera tua do-
mine ꝛ dirige filios
eorum.

Geſeoh þine ſcealcas.

ſpærum eazum.

Ans on þin ægen
peopc.

Ece drihten.

Ans heora bearn ge-
nece.

Blíðum mote.

Eſt ſit ſplendor domi-
ni dei noſtri ſuper
noſ. ꝛ opera manu-
um noſtrarum diri-
ge ſuper noſ.

ſeſe

and ſaved by him, who
liveſt and reigneſt God.

*Deus in adiutorium me-
um intende, domine ad
adiuvandum me feſti-
na.*

Look on me, O Lord
God,

With thy precious aid,
O Lord help me,
O be a ready help
To me in time to come
At my Life's need.

Glory be to.

Lord have Mercy.

Our Father.

And lead us not.

* *Reſpice in ſervos tuos
Domine ꝛ in opera
tua ꝛ dirige Filios
eorum.*

Look upon thy Ser-
vants,

With favourable Eyes.

And on thine own
Works,

Eternal Lord :

And their Sons direct,

With thy ſweet Grace.

† *Et ſit ſplendor Domini
Dei noſtri ſuper nos,
ꝛ opera manuum no-
ſtrarum dirige ſuper
nos.*

D d

Let

A P P E N D I X.

Ʒere us beoþhtnȳr.

Open bhðan ðrihtner.
Uner þær goðan Goðer.
Georne open ealle.

Geþeçe ure hanð ge-
þeore.

Deah open uric.

Gloria Patri.

* Opemur. ðirigene ȳ
sanctificare ac regere
ðignetur domine Deus
rex creator cœli ȳ ter-
ræ hodie quesumus co-
tidie contra ȳ corpora
nostræ actus quoque ȳ
sermone nostror in le-
ge tuæ ȳ in preceptis
mandatorum tuorum
ut hic ȳ ubique. per
te semper salui ȳ liberi
erige. meremur salua-
tor mundi qui cum pa-
tre ȳ spiritu sancto ui-
uis ȳ regnas Deus. per
omnia secula seculo-
rum. Amen.

Abiutorum nostrum
in nomine domini. qui
fecit cœlum ȳ terram.
Bene-

Let the favourable
Brightness

Of the Lord,
Of our good God,
Still be upon us,
And guide our handy-
work,

O thou most High.

Gloria Patri.

We beseech thee that
thou wouldst be pleased
to direct, sanctify, and
govern, O Lord God
and King, Creator of
Heaven and Earth, to
Day, and every Day;
both our Hearts and Bo-
dies, our Actions also
and Speeches in thy
Law, and in the Pre-
cepts of thy Command-
ments, that we may
both here, and every
where, thorough thee
be in safety, and free-
dom, O Saviour of the
World, who with the
Father and the Holy
Spirit, livest and reign-
est God throughout all
Ages. *Amen.*

Our help is in the
Lord our God, who
hath made Heaven and
Earth. Bless

* Compare this with the second Collect appointed to be
said in Our *Common-Prayer-Book* after the Offertory, when
there is no Communion, &c.

A P P E N D I X.

Benedicite. Deus dei
pilius nos benedicere
dignetur. Amen.

DE OFFICIO TER- TIE HORE.

On undern þe ſculon
Gode heþian. forðan on
undern timan Eyrst þær
ðær þara rices dom to
deaðe forðemes. ⁊ to-
pearð þære roðe gelað.
þe he ſyððan on þro-
pode. for ealles miððan
earðes alyresnyrre. ⁊
eft æfter his ærre.
on pentecostenes dæg
com þe halga gaste on
undern timan oþer ða
apostolar. þær hi æt
gæðes gefamode þæ-
non. ⁊ hi ealle ſona ge-
fyllde purdon ſpa riðe
mið Godes gýre. þæt hi
ealra geþeowða geting-
nesse hæfdon. ⁊ heora
lap pearð geonð ealne
miððan earð ſyððan ge-
eýðes ⁊ gebæles þeo-
dum to helpe. Undern
is dæges ðriðde. tid.
þonne is eac rihtlic þæt
þe to þære þriððan tide
þa halgan ðriðnesse ge-
oplice heþian.

Dd 1 Deus

Bless the Lord. The
Lord, the Son of God,
vouchsafe to bless us.

Amen.

*Of the Office of the third
Hour.*

At Undern we ought
to praise God, because
about that time Christ
was condemned to
Death by the Jewish
Sanhedrim, and was
led toward the Cross,
upon which afterward
he suffered. And again,
after his Resurrection,
the Holy Ghost came
upon the Apostles as
they were assembled to-
gether upon the day of
Pentecost about nine in
the Morning. And they
were all on a sudden so
powerfully filled with
the Grace of God, as to
have a ready Eloquence
in all Languages. And
their Doctrine was after-
wards publish'd and dis-
pers'd over all the Earth,
for the Benefit of the
Nations. Undern is the
third Hour of the Day.
And it is but just that at
the third Hour of the
Day we should diligent-
ly worship the Holy
Trinity. Lord

A P P E N D I X.

Deus in adiutorium
meum intende.

Гloria Patрi.

* DYONUS.

Nunc sancte nobis
spiritus.

Salmus. CAPTEL.

Грaтiа uobis ⁊ pax a
deo patрi nostro ⁊ do-
mino Iesu Crіsto.

Deo grаtiar.
Adiutor meus.
Кѣрпiе leiсon.
Crіste leiсon.

Кѣрпiе leiсon.

Pater noster.
Ego dixi Domine mi-
serere mei. sana ani-
mam

Lord come to my help.

Glory be to the Father.

HYMNUS.

*Nunc sancte nobis spi-
ritus.*

Psalms. CAPTEL.
the Lesson.

† Grace be to you
and Peace from God the
Father, and from our
Lord Jesus Christ.

Thanks be to God.

My Help.

Lord have Mercy on us.

Christ have Mercy on

us,

Lord have Mercy on
us.

Our Father.

‡ *Dixi Domine miserere
mei, sana animam
meam*

* Nunc sancte nobis spiritus,

Unum patri cum filio,
Dignare promptus ingeri,
Nostro refusus Pectori.

*Now Holy Spirit, thou who art but one,
With God the Father and his only Son,
Thy self to us most readily impart,
And let thy Comforts flow into our Heart.*

Os, lingua, mens, sensus, vigor,
Confessionem perfont.
Flammescat igne Caritas.
Accendat Ardor proximos.

*Our Mouth, our Tongue, our Mind, our Sense, our Force,
In Sounds of true Confession shall discourse,
True Charity shall flame with holy Fire,
And Neighbours love with mutual good Desire.*

See the Breviary in usum Sarum, ad Tertiam, fol. xlii. b.

† Rom. i. 7.

* Psal. xli. 4.

A P P E N D I X.

mam meam quia pec-
caui tibi.

Ic nu mægene cpeþe.
 Miltŕa me ðrihten.

Hæl mine ſaple.

Forþon me hŕeopeþ
 nu.

Ðat ic ſijene on ðe.

Fŕemebe geneaþ hige.
 Conuerſte domine ali-
 quantulum ꝥ ðeppe-
 cabiliſ eſto ſuper
 ſeruos tuos.

Gehŕeoŕf uſ hŕæt
 hpygu.

Haliſ ðrihten.

ƿær ðinum ſcealcum.

ƿel eaþ bene.

Mitte eiſ domine au-
 xilium.

Domine exaudi.

Dominuſ uobiſcum.

Domine Deus qui ho-
 ra tertia diei ad crucis
 poenam pro mundi ſa-
 lute ductuſ eſ. te ſup-
 pliciter deprecamur ut
 de preteritiſ maliſ no-
 ſtriſ ſemper apud te
 inueniamuſ ueniam ꝥ de
 futuriſ iugiter habea-
 muſ cuſtodiam. qui
 cum patre.

meam quia peccavi
 tibi.

I now ſtrongly cry,
 Have Mercy on me
 Lord.

Heal my Soul,
 For I now repent,

That with ſuch Eager-
 neſs,

I have transgreſs'd.

* *Conuerſte Domine ali-
 quantulum ꝥ depreca-
 bilis eſto ſuper ſervos
 tuos.*

Turn to uſ a little,

Holy Lord,

And for thy Servants

Be eaſily ontreated.

Send them thy help.

O Lord hear uſ.

The Lord be with you.

O Lord our God, who
 at the third Hour of the
 Day waſt led to the Pu-
 niſhment of the Croſs
 for the Salvation of the
 World. We humbly be-
 ſeech thee that we may
 both find pardon with
 thee for our paſt Sins,
 and likewise thy prote-
 ction for the time to
 come, who with the
 Father.

Dd 3 DE

* *Pſal. lxxxix. 15.*

A P P E N D I X.

DE OFFICIO SEXTE HORE.

On midne dæg we
 ſculon God heþian. for-
 ðam to miððer dæges
 Crīst wæs on rode a ðe-
 ned. 7 uſ ealle þa þurh
 hiſ ðropunge. mið hiſ
 ðeopprðan bloðe ge-
 bohte. of ðeoſles an-
 wealde 7 of ecan ðeaðe.
 7 ðy we ſculon on ðone
 tīman to Crīste beon
 georne clypiðende. 7
 hine hepiðende þæt we
 mið þam geſpytelian.
 þæt we gemýnbiðe be-
 on. þære mýclan mið-
 heortnýſſe. þe he on
 mancýnne gepophhte þa
 ða he let hine gýlfne
 gýllan to cweale. for
 mancýnnes ðearfe.

Deus in adiutorium
 meum intende.

Gloria Patri.

* HYMNUS.

Rector potens uerax.

EA-

Of the Office of the third Hour.

At Mid-day we ought
 to worship God, because
 at Mid-day Christ was
 stretched out upon the
 Cross. And did then by
 his Sufferings and preci-
 ous Blood redeem all of
 us from the power of
 the Devil, and of Eter-
 nal Death. And we
 ought therefore at that
 time to be diligently cal-
 ling upon Christ, and
 praising him that we
 may thereby make it
 manifest that we are
 mindful of the mani-
 fold Mercies he then
 wrought for Mankind,
 when he permitted him-
 self to be delivered up
 to Death for the sake of
 Man.

Lord be thou my Aid.

Glory be to the Father.

HYMNUS.

Rector potens uerax.

The

* Rector potens uerax Deus,

Qui temperas rerum vices

Splendore mane instruis,

Et ignibus meridiem.

Extingue flammam litium,

Aufer calorem noxium,

Confer salutem corporum.

Veramque pacem cordium.

Might

A P P E N D I X.

CAPITULA.

Omnia autem probate quod bonum est tenete. ab omni specie. mala abstinete uos.

Deo gratias.

Dominus regit me.

Kýrrie leison.

Episte leison.

Kýrrie leison.

COLLETA.

Domine Iesu Episte qui sexta hora pro nobis in cruce ascendisti. et Adam de inferno eruisi. eumque in paradiso restituisi. te quaerimus ut ab omnibus peccatis nostris eripe nos iubeas et in ope-

The LESSON.

† Prove all things, hold fast that which is good. Abstain from all appearance of Evil.

Thanks be to God.

The Lord governs me.

Lord have Mercy on us.

Christ have Mercy upon us.

Lord have Mercy upon us.

The COLLECT.

O Lord Jesu Christ, who at the sixth Hour didst ascend upon the Cross for us, and who didst bring Adam out of Hell and restore him to Paradise, we beseech thee that thou wouldst cause us to be delivered from

D d 4

Mighty Ruler, God most true,
All things their Changes from thee shew,
Thou dost adorn the Morn with Light.
With burning Fires, makest Mid-day bright.

Extinguish Flames of Enmity,
The noxious Heat far banish'd be,
Upon our Bodies Health bestow,
And true Peace to our Hearts allow.

Presta pater piissime,
Patrique compar unice,
Cum spiritu paraclito,
Regnans per omne seculum. Amen.

Most bounteous Father, be this done,
Accord his Peer, thou only Son,
With the Spirit paraclete,
Reigning thro' Ages incomplete. Amen.

See the Breviary in usum Sarum, ad Sextam, fol. xiv. b.

† 1 Thess. v. 21, 22.

A P P E N D I X.

openibur euis sanctis
semper custodias. Iesu
Christe qui cum.

from all our Sins, and
that thou wouldst keep
us evermore in thy holy
Works. O Lord Jesu
Christ, who with.

On nontiman þe se-
lon Godes heþian. for-
ðam on þone timan
Erist gebæd. for ðam
þe him ðereþon. 7 gýð-
ðan his gart arende. 7
on ðone timan seculon
geleafulle men hi geor-
ne gebiddan. 7 gemunan
þæt punðor þæ geþor-
ben pearð. þa se sylfa
for mancýn ðeað geþo-
lobe þe eallum man-
cýnne lifes geuðe.

At Noon we ought
to praise God, because
at that time Christ
prayed for those that
persecuted him. And
afterwards sent his Spi-
rit. And at that time
ought all faithful Men
to pray diligently; and
to be mindful of that
Miracle which was then
wrought, when he him-
self suffered Death for
all Mankind, who gi-
veth life to all Men.

Deus in adiutorium
meum.

Deus in adiutorium meum.

Gloria Patri.

Glory be to the Father.

* HYMNUS.

HYMNUS.

Requiem Deus tenax
vigor. CA-

*Rerum Deus tenax
vigor. CA.*

* Rerum Deus tenax vigor,
Immotus in te permanens,
Lucis diurnæ tempora,
Successibus determinans,
Largire clarum vespere,
Quo vita nusquam decidat,
Sed premium mortis sacræ,
Perennis instet gloria.

O God of Things, the steadfast Power,
Unmoved in thy self remaining
Who art of Daylight every Hour,
And their Successions still ordaining.

Grant unto us an Evening clear,
Where Life by no means fades away,
But holy Death's Price doth appear,
In Glory that shall not decay, &c.

See the Breviary in usum Sarum, ad Nonam, fol. xv. a.

A P P E N D I X.

CAPITULA.

Altæn altærnuſ hope-
na poſtate. ⁊ ſic ad-
implebitur legem Eriſti.

Deo gr̃atias.

Ab oculis meis mun-
da me domine.

Kýrriel'. Eriſtel'.
Kýrrie.

COLLECT.

Domine Ieſu Eriſte
qui hora nona in crucis
patibulo conſitentem
latronem intra mœnia
paradiſi tranſiſte iur-
iſti. tibi ſuppliciter
conſitentes peccata
noſtra deprecamur de-
leat. ⁊ poſt obitum
noſtrum paradiſi nobis
gaudia introiſſe conce-
dat ſaluator mundi. qui
cum patre.

Ad uerſepum.

On æfen þe ſculon
Gob heſian on ðone ti-
man man offrode on
þæne ealban æ. ⁊ mið
neceſſ peocan on ðam
temple þæt peofoð ge-
orne peonðode Gode to
lofe. ⁊ on æfen timan
upne drihten offrode.

æt

CAPITULA.

* *Bear ye one another's
Burthens, and ſo ye ſhall
fulfil the Law of Chriſt.*

Thanks be to God.

Cleanſe me from my
ſecret faults, O Lord.

Lord have, &c.

COLLECT.

O Lord Jeſu Chriſt,
who at the ninth Hour
of the Day didſt com-
mand the penitent Thief
upon the Croſs to enter
into the Walls of Para-
diſe. We humbly ma-
king our Confession to
thee, beſeech thee to
blot out our Offences,
and grant that after our
Life ended here, we may
enter into the Joys of
Paradiſe, O Saviour of
the World, who with
the Father.

For the Evening Service

Et even we ought to
praiſe God, this being
the time of Offering
under the old Law:
and they were then ac-
cuſtom'd diligently to
burn Incenſe upon the
Altar in the Temple to
the praiſe of God. And

at

* Gal. vi. 2.

A P P E N D I X.

æt his æpen geneorðe
 ⁊ bæðe his discipulum
 þurh halig gemyne hlap
 ⁊ þin for his sylfes li-
 chaman. ⁊ for his agen-
 bloð.

And on æpen tīman
 hit wæs þ̅ Joseph Epi-
 scopus Lichamin of þode
 alinode. þonne se agen
 myccle þearpe þ̅ se
 sylfe gemunan ⁊ Gode
 þancian. ⁊ on þone tī-
 man we gebedu unum
 drihtne georne ofþri-
 an eal swa Dauid swæð.
Dixitque domine ab re-
operatio mea. sicut in-
censum in conspectu
tuo.

Sy on ðinre geryhðe.
 Wyrre sylfes gebed.
 Full wene geneht.
 Swa neceð bið.
 Þonne hit gýrre.
 Gleða bærnað.

Dominus in adiutori-
 um meum intende.

Gloria Patri.

Gratia domini nostri
 Iesu Christi ⁊ caritatis dei
 ⁊ communicatio spiri-
 tus sancti sit semper
 cum omnibus nobis.

Deo

at Evening time our
 Lord offered at his own
 Table, and delivered to
 his Disciples thro' holy
 Mystery, Bread and
 Wine, for his own
 Body, and for his own
 Blood.

And it was at Even-
 ing that *Joseph* took down
 Christ's Body from the
 Cross. Then ought we
 in much Duty to be
 mindful of this, and to
 thank God: And at
 that time earnestly to
 offer up our Prayers to
 our Lord, as *David*
 saith, *Let my Prayer, O*
Lord, be directed to thee,
even as incense in thy
sight.

Let my supplication
 Be in thy sight, O Lord.
 Immediately sent up,
 As the Incense is

When the fierce heat
 it consumes.

O Lord make haste
 to help me.

Glory be to the Father.

† *The Grace of our*
Lord Jesus Christ, and
the Love of God, and the
Fellowship of the Holy
Ghost be with us all e-
vermore. Thanks

A P P E N D I X.

Deo gratias. R. Ad-
iutorium nostrum in
nomine domini.

V. Qui fecit cælum
et terram.

* HYMNUS.

O lux beata trinitas.

V. Dirigatur domine
ad te oratio meo.

Misericordia dei et
sanctum nomen eius
super timentes eum.

Pf. Magnificat.

Κύριε ἰσον.

Εἰστε

Thanks be to God.
R. Our help is in the
Name of the Lord.

V. who hath made
Heaven and Earth.

HYMNUS.

O Lux Beata trinitas.

V. Let my Prayer come
up to thee, O Lord.

The Mercy of the
Lord, and his holy
Name is upon them
that fear him.

*Let the Magnificat be
sung.*

Lord have Mercy
upon us.

Christ

* O lux beata trinitas.

Et principalis unitas.

Jam sol recedit igneus.

Infunde lumen cordibus.

Te mane laudum carmine,

Te deprecemur vesperi,

Te nostra supplex gloria,

Per cuncta laudet secula.

Deo patri fit gloria,

Ejusque soli filio,

Cum spiritu paraclito,

Et nunc & in perpetuum.

O Trinity, thou blessed Light,

And Unity chief Source of all,

The fiery Sun now takes his flight,

Upon our Hearts let thy Light fall.

At Morning Lauds we sing our Praise,

At Evening to thee we pray;

Our humble Glory thy just Praise,

Doth hope to celebrate alway.

To God the Father, th' only Son, and the glad-making Spirit,

All Glory ever be and one, for their Eternal Merit.

V. Breviar. seu Portiforium in usum Sarum, sabbato ad
Complectorium, fol. iii. a.

A P P E N D I X.

ƒriſte leiſon.

Kýnnie leiſon.

Pater noſter.

Et ne noſ inbucaſ in
temptationem.

Precer ego dixi do-
mine.

COLLECTA.

Opemur uerſepe. ⁊
mane ⁊ meridie.

Maiestatem tuam
ſuppliciter exoramus.
ut expulſiſ de conſiſibur
noſtriſ peccatorum
tenebris. ad ueram lu-
cem quæ ƒriſtus eſt
noſ faciaſ perueniſe.
per.

AD COMPLETORIO.

On ſoþan niht pe
ſculon God heþian. æp
pe to bebbe gan. ⁊ ge-
munan ꝥ ƒriſt on býn-
geþe neah ſoþan nihte
bebýrgeþ þearð. ⁊ ðær
hiſ lichaman on geþerte.
ſpa lange ſpa hiſ willa wæſ.
þonne age þe þær micle
þearfe. þæt þe ꝥ geþen-
can ⁊ uſ gýlfe on ðone
tuman Gode betæcan æp
pe to bebbe gan. ⁊ hine
biððan ꝥ he uſ geþerfe
perfe

Chriſt have Mercy
on uſ.

Lord have Mercy on
uſ.

Our Father.

And lead uſ not into
temptation.

Unto thee, O Lord,
have I made my ſuppli-
cation.

The COLLECT.

At Evening, and
Morning, and Mid-
day, let uſ pray.

We humbly beſeech
thy Maieſty, that ha-
ving expell'd out of our
Hearts the darkneſs of
our Sins, thou wouldeſt
bring uſ to the true
Light, which is Chriſt,
through.

The Completorium.

At the beginning of
the Night we ought to
praiſe God, before we
go to Bed ; And to re-
member that about the
fore-part of the Night
Chriſt was buried in hiſ
Sepulchre, where hiſ
Body reſted ſo long as
it was hiſ pleaſure. Then
it is highly our Duty,
to conſider that with
our ſelves, and at that
time to betake our ſelves
to

A P P E N D I X.

nerre geunna 7 pið be-
oþles corþnunga 7er-
cýlðe 7pa hīr þilla 7y.

to God, before we go
to Bed. And to beg of
him to give us conveni-
ent rest, and defend us
against the temptations
of the Devil, so be it
his Will:

Conuepte noꝝ Deuꝝ.
Deuꝝ in adiutorium
meum.

Turn thou us, O God.
God be my help.

* HYMNUS.

HYMNUS.

Te lucis ante termi-
num. Eriſte qui lux es
7 dies.

*Te lucis ante termi-
num, Chriſte qui lux es
& dies.*

IN

IN

* Te lucis ante terminum,
Rerum Creator poſcimus,
Ut ſolitas clementia,
Sis preſul ad-cuſtodiam.
Procul recedant ſomnia,
Et noctium fantaſmata,
Hoſtemque noſtrum comprime,
Ne polluantur corpora.
Preſta pater omnipotens,
Per Jeſum Chriſtum dominum.
Qui tecum in perpetuum,
Regnatcum ſancto ſpiritu. *Amen.*
*Before day-light begins to cloſe,
Creator of all things we crave,
Thy Clemency may things diſpoſe,
That thee our Guardian we may have.
Let Dreams be ſcatter'd far away,
And ugly Fantoms of the Night,
Our Enemy let us diſmay,
While unpolluted in the Fight.
Grant this Father Omnipotent,
Through Jeſus Chriſt our bleſſed Lord,
Who with thee, ever permanent,
And th' Holy Ghoſt rules in accord. Amen.*

See the Breviary in uſum Sarum, printed Anno 1656, in
O dinem Completorij, fol. liii. b. and liiii. a.

A P P E N D I X.

IN NOCTE.

Tu in nobis es domine
et nomen sanctum
tuum invocatum est
super nos ne derelin-
quas nos domine Deus
noctem. deo gratias.

Custodi nos domine
ut pupillam oculi.

Kýnnie leison.

Erlyte leison.

Kýnnie leison.

Pater noctem.

• Egrebo in deum pa-
trem.

Benedicamus patri.

Benedictus es domine.

Benedicat et custo-
diat nos omnipotens
Deus. Amen.

Dignare domine no-
cte ista.

Opemur.

Visita domine ha-
bitationem istam et
omnes iniquitates muni-
ci ab ea longe repelle.
angeli tui nos in ea pa-
ce custodiant. et bene-
dictio

IN THE NIGHT.

† Thou art in us, O
Lord, and thy holy
Name is called upon us.
For sake us not, O Lord
God. Thanks be to
God.

‡ *Keep us as the apple
of the Eye.*

Lord have Mercy
upon us.

Christ have Mercy
upon us.

Lord have Mercy
upon us.

Our Father.

I believe in God the
Father.

Let us bless the Fa-
ther.

Blessed art thou, O
Lord. May the Al-
mighty Lord bless and
keep us. *Amen.*

Vouchsafe, O Lord,
this Night.

Let us pray.

Visit, O Lord, this
Habitation, and drive
away all the Snares of
the Enemy far from it.
Let thy Angels watch
over us in it in Peace.

Ans

† *Hieremias*, ch. xiv. v. 9. the English Translation hath
it thus, *Thou, O Lord, art in the midst of us, and we are
called by thy Name, leave us not.*

‡ *Psal. xivii. 8.*

A P P E N D I X.

dictio tua sit super
nos semper per eun-
dem. Dominus vobis-
cum. Benedicamus do-
mino: Benedictio dei
patris omnipotentis et
filii. et spiritus sancti.
maneant semper vobis-
cum. Amen.

DE NOCTURNA- LIA CELEBRA- TIONE.

On uhtan þe sculon
Godes herian. eal swa Da-
uid cƿæð. Media nocte
surgebam ad confiten-
dum tibi super iudicia
iustitiæ tuæ. Ðæt is.
to middre niht ic aras
ðrihten. et cetera.
Eriste sylf beas þæt
þe georne pacian sceol-
dan. he cƿæð. Urigila-
te ergo quia nescitis
quando ueniet dominus.
þæt bið. Paciað georne.
forðam þe ge ný-
ton hyenne eowes ðriht-
ten cýmð. et est. he
cƿæð. Beati serui illi
quos cum uenerit do-
minus. þæt is. eadige
beoð þa men þe se hla-
forð pacienbe gemet.
þonne

And thy blessing always
be upon us, thro' the
same. The Lord be
with you. Let us praise
the Lord. The blessing
of God Almighty, the
Father, the Son, and
the Holy Ghost remain
with you evermore.

Amen.

Of the Midnight Office.

At Midnight we ought
to praise God, as *David*
saith, † *Media nocte*,
&c. that is, *At Mid-*
night I arose, O Lord,
&c. Christ himself com-
manded that we should
watch diligently: He
saith, † *Vigilate*, &c.
that is, *Watch ye dili-*
gently, for ye know not
the Hour when your Lord
cometh. † *Beati*, &c.
Blessed are the Men
whom the Lord shall find
watching when he cometh.
We have great need to
watch diligently and be-
ware, forasmuch as death
will not tell us when he
will come, * *No more*
than the Thief; but he
com-

† Ps. cxix 62.

† Mat. xxiv. 42.

† y. 46.

* y. 42

A P P E N D I X.

þonne he to cȳmð. Ur
 is mȳcel ðearf þ̅ pe
 geornlice pacian 7 p̅æpe
 beon. forþam nele ðeað
 na cȳðan h̅enne he
 cuman pȳle. þe ma þe
 þe of ac he cȳmþ þonne
 man leſt penð. þonne
 bið se p̅p̅yðe geſælig
 ſe ðe bið þonne paci-
 genðe. se bið pacigenðe
 se ðe aſmeað ȳmbe
 Godes willan 7 ȳmbe his
 ægene þearfe. 7 on ðam
 geendað. 7 se biþ ſleac.
 7 ſlæpenðe. se ðe full-
 gæð eallum his lȳðrum
 luſtum. Ðurh ðeofles
 lape. 7 on þam geendap.
 7 þonne age se mȳcle
 þearfe. þæt se georn-
 lice pacian. 7 a p̅æpe
 beon wif ðeofles coſt-
 nunga. 7 þæt se georne
 to Gode clȳpian. 7 to
 him ge eapnian þæt he
 us geſȳlſte. þurh his
 miðheortnȳſſe. þ̅ pe
 on upum ende timan
 p̅pa pacigenðe beon on
 godum bædum þæt se
 rȳþþan a us geſeſtan
 maðan 7 motan on ece-
 ne p̅eſte. Nu ic hæbbe
 beſuman bæle ahpeoð
 beþam bæghp̅amlican
 tidan þenungan þe
 man

cometh at that time,
 when Men leaſt think
 of it ; then is he very
 happy, who is at that
 time waking. Now he
 is watchful, who is ſtu-
 dious concerning the
 Will of God, and his
 own Duty, and who
 ends his life in theſe
 things. And he is ſlack,
 and ſleepy, who gives
 full ſwing to his hate-
 ful Luſts, being the De-
 vil's Diſciple, and who
 dies in them. So that
 it is very highly our
 Duty to be diligently
 watchful and wary a-
 gainſt the temptations
 of the Devil, and ear-
 neſtly to call upon God ;
 and to entreat of him
 his help, that thro' his
 mercifulneſs we may at
 the end of our lives, ſo
 be found watching in
 good works, that we
 may for ever after be a-
 ble and permitted to
 take our reſoſe in ever-
 laſting Reſt. Now have
 I in ſome meaſure treated
 of the times for the daily
 Service of God which
 Men

A P P E N D I X.

man to nýðrhte don
ſceall.

Ðonne iſ mycel þe-
arſ þ̅ man unbeytanðe
þ̅ man to eacan þam
oſt. ⁊ ungelðan ſceall
Gob heſian. ⁊ to gode
clýpian for manegum
neoðan. eall ſpa ſe a-
poſtol cƿæþ. *Sine inter-
missione opate.* þ̅ iſ.
Beoþ a ſýmble eoƿ ge-
biððenðe. ⁊ eſt ſe apoſ-
tol cƿæð. *Sive enim
manducatis. sive bibi-
tis. sive aliud quid fa-
citis. omnia in gloriam
dei facitis.* þæt iſ. Gýp
ge etan. oððon ðrincan
oððon elles hƿæt pýp-
cean. ðon þæt geðon.
ðoð eall gode þancienðe
⁊ heƿugenðe. Beo þæt
ðinga þæt hit beo þæt
ſeman to note pýpcean
pýlle. biððe he gob ful-
tumer à à him ſpeþþ þe-
bet. eall ſpa Dauid cƿæþ.
*Adiutor meus esto do-
mine.* þ̅ iſ. Min ðrihten
beo min fultum. ⁊ eſt
he cƿæð. *Adiutorium
noſtrum in nomine do-
mini. qui fecit celum ⁊
terram.* þ̅ iſ

Men are in Duty bound
to perform.

It is alſo very neceſ-
ſary that Men ſhould
underſtand how to add
oſten to theſe, and not
to be ſeldom, *i. e.* back-
ward in praizing God,
and calling upon him,
on many occasions; as
the Apoſtle ſaith, * *Be
always praying.* And
afterwards the Apoſtle
ſays, † *If ye eat, or drink
or do any thing else, do
all, thanking, and prai-
sing God.* Be there any
thing that a Man ſhould
do in his charge, or em-
ployment, let him beg
God's aſſiſtance, and it
always ſpeeds the better
with him; as *David*
ſaith, *Adjutor, &c. My
Lord, be my Help.* And
again he ſays, *Adjuto-
rium, &c.* that is,

Upe

E e

God

* 1 *Theſſ.* v. 17.

† 1 *Cor.* x. 31.

APPENDIX.

Upe fultum is Eob.
De gerceop 7 ge-
pophre.

Deoponar 7 eopðan.
And ealle gerceapta.

Eob is gefultumige.
To upe ðearpe.

Sya his pylla ry.
Amen.

God is our aid.
Who made and did
create

The Heavens and
Earth.

And all the Creatures.
God be our aid.
When e'er we stand
in need.

So be it his Will.
Amen.

FINIS.



